

THE EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY

(Continuation of *Eastern Churches* Number of "Pax,"
founded 1931.)

VOL. IV

APRIL, 1940

No. 2

THE LITURGY AND REUNION

II.

SOME LEADING IDEAS IN THE PRIMITIVE LITURGIES.

IN our first article we concluded by saying that we would bring the searchlight of the Liturgy and Tradition to bear on different Christian bodies. Before, however, we venture on this, it may be best to consider some of the leading ideas in the primitive Liturgies, and this we suggest not from any mere love of liturgical antiquity but from the desire to deal with the subject of liturgy and reunion in a practical and vital way.

We are well aware that in speaking of some leading ideas in the primitive Liturgies we will be treating of vexed and debatable questions; nevertheless, we think that in the common cause these questions should be posed and we trust that those more learned will, in the course of future articles, throw light on these matters. It is, then, with the intention rather of suggesting the line on which future articles should turn than in any way giving a definitive statement on questions that challenge many points in theology, history as well as liturgy, that the following remarks are made.

It may be queried whether the epiclesis is really a vital or practical question since historically it did not come into any prominence until the Renaissance. Even at the Council of Florence it was not mentioned in the first rank of importance although since then some Orthodox theologians have attached great weight to it. Yet we think its present importance arises from a revived interest in the question on the part of many Anglicans, brought to the fore by their discussions on Prayer-book Revision in 1906—1929. It was in connection with this that both the pamphlet of Father Hebert and the book of Bishop Frere were written. The question thus revived is still uppermost in many minds especially in considering the larger issues of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

In this article we have often referred to Mr. Edmund Bishop, on the Catholic side, since in addition to his well known liturgical and historical reputation he was in touch with the controversial literature on the subject.

"In the Divine redemptive work there is *first* the vicarious work of Christ for us, which consists in the manifestation in flesh and blood, under human conditions, of the Divine Goodness—in the accomplishment of the work that the Father gave him to do, up to the moment when he could say 'It is finished,' and beyond that to the risen and ascended glory of the manhood of the Saviour. This is the vicarious sacrifice of Christ, worked out on earth in his whole self-offering in life and death—'Lo, I come to do thy will, O God'—and abiding forever in his permanent presence in heaven (Heb. ix, 24) as Priest and Victim. *Second*, there is the actualization in the many sons of the salvation which came to this world in the One—the fulfilment of Christ in his Church, which is his Body, the fulness of him who all in all is being fulfilled (Eph. i, 23; Robinson, *Ephesians*, p. 42 ff.)—the continuing work of the Holy Spirit, transforming the faithful into the image of Christ (2 Cor. iii, 18). The first is God's work *for* us, the second His work *in* us.

"Broadly speaking, the first is the work of the Son, the second the work of the Spirit. . . . Therefore the Eucharist, as being the liturgical representation of God's redeeming work, must likewise exhibit both aspects. We may regard it *from the side of the Son*: Christ the High Priest, the Head of the Church, is the true celebrant of every Eucharist; he offers anew his own sacrifice, renews in every Eucharist his own institution, and makes the memorial of his own death, resurrection and ascension; then when in the communion he bestows his own body and blood, he is carrying on his once finished work and reaping its fruits, by uniting his people with his own sacrifice, that they also may become a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice, sharing in his suffering and his triumph, crucified with him that they may be also glorified with him.

"We may say that this is the typical point of view of the Latin rite. We may equally regard it *from the side of the Holy Spirit*: he who was the agent of the incarnation comes in awful majesty to consecrate the earthly elements to be the living bread and cup of salvation; and he is likewise the agent of the divine operation, through these sacramental means, in the hearts of the faithful, uniting them with Christ, overcoming in them the egocentric mind and outlook, bringing forth in them the fruits of the Spirit, and making their lives

an offering to God. This is the typical point of view of the Eastern liturgies.

"The eucharistic Canon, being the central comprehensive act of thanksgiving and prayer in which the meaning of the whole is summed up, must likewise express both elements, the one sacrifice of Christ, and the continual offering-up of the Church. The Liturgies set forth the work of the Son in a variety of ways, centring in the recital of the Institution, which occurs in every known liturgy, with one doubtful exception. Likewise they set forth the work of the Holy Spirit, above all in the Epiclesis of the Spirit, which likewise occurs in every known liturgy, with the exception of the Roman tradition and the rites which have followed it."¹

Thus Father Hebert sets out some of the leading ideas of the ancient Liturgies in a popular and practical way. We have quoted from him at length because he represents both the present liturgical movement and the central Anglo-Catholic school of thought in the Anglican Church.

The first thing to note, we think, is the setting out in broad terms of the traditional and liturgical idea of the Christian Oblation and Sacrifice. We do not, however, intend here to treat of the patristic conception of the Christian Sacrifice as distinct from that considered in Scholastic and Counter-Reformation times (if there is a distinction); this is worthy of a special article in itself.

Let us turn now and consider the Primitive Eucharistic Rite.² We will confine ourselves to the Eucharist proper and leave on one side the consideration of the Synaxis; we then have the Offertory, the Prayer, the Fraction and the Communion.

The Offertory. After the kiss of peace the deacons collect the oblations of bread and wine that the people have themselves brought. The technical word used for this "bringing up" of the offerings by the deacons is ἀναφέρειν.

The Eucharistic Prayer. This was simply "the prayer"; for many early Greek writers it was simply ἡ εὐχή as it was for later Roman ones *prex*.³ This begins with the dialogue of the

¹ *The Meaning of the Epiclesis*, by A. G. Hebert, reprinted from *Theology*, October, 1933, and published by the S.P.C.K.

² Vid: *The Anaphora*, W. H. Frere, sp. cap IV. *The Idea of "The Church" in the Primitive Liturgies*, Gregory Dix, both S.P.C.K.

³ The term *Canon* in the modern sense seems to date from St. Gregory I. The parallel Eastern term *Anaphora* has this history:—The verb ἀναφέρειν is commonly used in the Septuagint for offering a sacrifice. It passed into Christian use, and the substantive with it, first as a general term (Origen, *In Evang. Joh.* VI, 33, 34); then as meaning the liturgy, but it seems to refer in pre-Nicene times to the function of the deacons as προσφέρειν to that of the bishops (e.g., in *Serapion's Sacramentary*); and finally as the technical term for the central part of it said by the celebrant (cf. Dix and Frere).

Sursum Corda. An enumeration of God's mercies to mankind is then made—the Creation, Incarnation, and Redemption are mentioned and then the account of the Institution followed by the *anamnesis*. The word *anamnesis* Dom Gregory Dix says "is not an easy word to translate adequately. Words like 'memorial,' 'remembrance' have in English a connotation of something which is itself 'absent.' 'Ανάμνησις has, on the contrary, the sense of 'recalling,' of making a past thing 'present' again, so that it is here and now *operative by its effects*." It recalls Christ's death, resurrection and ascension. Then a petition for Communion: "And we pray thee—that thou wouldst grant to all thy saints who partake to be made one, that they may be fulfilled with the Holy Spirit for the confirmation of (their) faith in truth, in order that we may praise thee." (Hippolytus. See note on this passage further on).

Then comes the *Fraction* and the *Communion* and so the end.¹

It is this petition for Communion that has developed into the Epiclesis as in the present Eastern Liturgies. The first explicit Invocation of the Holy Spirit "on the gifts, to make the bread the Body of Christ, and the wine the Blood of Christ," is St. Cyril of Jerusalem in his catechetical lecture given in 348 (spec. *Catech.* XIX (i), 7, and XXI (iii), 3).

The authorities² speak of the rhythmic idea underlying the canon as Trinitarian (rather in the same way as is the *Gloria in Excelsis*). Hence this prayer to the Holy Spirit at the end of the Eucharistic prayer is what one would expect; God the Father is thanked for his mercies, the Incarnation and Redemption are dwelt on, special stress is given to Our Lord's words at the Institution, and then there is the mention of the Holy Spirit. But as regards the traditional place of the epiclesis Cardinal Schuster has this to say: "The natural and traditional place for these epicleses is before the account of the Last Supper, as it is actually found in Rome,³ in Egypt,⁴ and formerly also in Antioch.⁵ Afterwards, however, the traditional form underwent a change—the East, especially at the time of the Macedonian controversies, regarding the divinity of the Para-

¹ Both the *Sanctus* and the *Pater Noster* at the end of the Canon come from Jerusalem in the fourth century. Also in this century there is a brief public thanksgiving after communion.

² Schuster, *The Sacramentary*, Vol. I, p. 107; Frere constantly refers to it, *ibid.* spec. cap III, also pp. 168 and 169.

³ See Edmund Bishop on the prayer *Quam oblationem* in Appendix VI to *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai* by Dom R. H. Connolly, pp. 133-133b and 150-152.

⁴ Both the Logos epiclesis in the Sacramentary of Serapion, and also in the Oxford Papyrus with its invocation of the Holy Spirit. Vid. Frere *ibid.* cap. X, and E. Bishop *ibid.* p. 138 and p. 144 (note 2).

⁵ One would like a reference! (2, 3, 4 and 5 are Author's notes.)

plete, and because the descent of the Holy Ghost was also invoked after the *anamnesis*, in order to obtain thereby the effective participation of the faithful in the eucharistic feast, the one epiclesis was confused with the other, and the pre-consecratory invocation thus became post-consecratory. The immediate effect of this transposition was to postpone the mystery of the transubstantiation until after the *anamnesis* and the offering of the Sacrifice ; in fact, it came about eventually that in the East, contrary to the ancient patristic tradition, all consecratory efficacy was denied to Our Lord's words, and exclusively assigned to this later and misplaced epiclesis of the Holy Ghost."¹ Edmund Bishop² makes a very strong case against the possibility of a consecratory Invocation of the Holy Spirit before the second half of the fourth century based³ on the state of the popular mind both clerical and lay as regards whether or not the Holy Ghost was a Third Coequal Person of the Godhead. He refers to the works of St. Basil and the two Gregorys showing how comparatively few were in possession of the full doctrine of the Holy Ghost ; and also, in the very controversy itself, how proofs in favour of the Holy Spirit's coequal Godhead are drawn from his sanctifying operations in the Church and in holy baptism, but no word is mentioned of his invocation in the Eucharist. This however, may be merely negative evidence. Mr. Bishop goes further. "The question arises," he says, "whether the witness of antiquity does not throw the work of sanctification and change of the bread and wine in the Eucharist, not on the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, but on the Second ; and whether this is not, from Justin downward to Gregory of Nyssa, the only teaching witnessed to by ecclesiastical writers, with the exception of Cyril of Jerusalem about the middle of the fourth century. With this single exception, I have been able to find a passage in no writer earlier than St. John Chrysostom in the East, and Optatus in the West, ascribing the consecration of the bread and wine specifically to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity. In these circumstances, the witness of antiquity until *c.* 350 failing to assign

¹ Schuster, *ibid.* pp. 283, 284.

² E. Bishop, *ibid.* pp. 138-141.

³ He also shows that the text of St. Irenaeus that supported the epiclesis theory is now proved not to be genuine—*ibid.* pp. 136 and 137. To which must be added the conclusion to which Dom Gregory Dix has come in his book *The Apostolic Tradition*, namely that the phrase in Hippolytus's petition for Communion—"that thou wouldest send thy Holy Spirit upon the oblation of thy Holy Church" (which for this reason we left out in the quotation above), is an interpolation of Syrian and later origin. But for arguments in favour of its being in some of the Hippolytean Anaphorae before the fourth century (i.e., before the introduction of the "Sanctus" into the Canon), see Frere, *ibid.* pp. 60 and 61.

the work of the sanctification and change of the bread and wine in the Eucharist to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, the question arises, I repeat, whether or how far such operation is expressly assigned by ecclesiastical writers to the Second Person (as in the canon of Serapion) . . ."¹

We have stressed this point as to whether the consecratory Invocation of the Holy Spirit was or was not traditional in the early days of the Church so as to see the question of the Epiclesis in its right proportion. We rather think there is a tendency among certain people to overstress its importance. It is quite true that since the fourth century and up to the present time the universal tradition in the East is to consider the epiclesis as completing the Words of Institution in changing the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and this has been a gradual growth,² but has, of course, been more explicit since the Schism³; but it is important to realize that there is an equal and even earlier tradition on the side of the Roman Church which too includes an epiclesis prayer though with no certain invocation of the Holy Spirit.⁴

The general mind of the Church considered the whole canon or anaphora as one prayer said over the bread and wine, and that through this was the Eucharistic Sacrifice made and so was Christ's true body and blood offered up by priest and people. It was the Sacrifice which is supreme in the *rationale* of the Eucharist; the offering of the gifts; the prayer for their hallowing; the Act of offering in remembrance of Christ; the prayer for their acceptance by the Father; the feeding upon the gifts thus offered, blessed, accepted, and now administered to the offerers in a new quality.

That during the course of centuries the question should have been raised: "At what point does the Consecration take place?" or "By what divine operation?" is natural. That when the position of the Holy Ghost was clearly established some should lay stress on prayer to the Holy Spirit, others on the Words of Institution in answer to the question is natural. Though two such outlooks did not exclude each other until the bitterness of controversy hardened them into opposition.

We cannot however end this slight treatment of an important matter without again referring to Father Hebert. The real gist of his article already quoted is to show that the *meaning* even of the developed epiclesis is not only that of consecration

¹ *Ibid.* p. 142.

² See Frere, *ibid.* cap. XVI.

³ *Ibid.* cap. XVII, where he treats of the controversy at the time of the Schism and the Council of Florence very fairly.

⁴ Some authorities think Rome once had an invocation of the Holy Spirit, e.g., Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, p. 120; Adrian Fortescue, article in *Catholic Encyclopaedia*. Others as we have seen do not.

of the bread and wine—this interpretation he holds has been too common on the part of Anglicans—but also, for the communicants, it is also an offering-up of the Church.¹ This brings us back to the leading idea of the Eucharist as the Sacrifice of the whole Church, and here we would leave the question. This however suggests the further question, already hinted at, what was the Patristic conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and how did the localizing (so to speak) of the moment of consecration affect this idea of sacrifice in both the Middle Ages and the Counter Reformation Period as also in the East.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

In the next issue there will be an article treating of the tradition of the Words of Consecration from the Eastern Fathers.—EDITOR.

PLATONISM AND PIETY

DOM BEDE GRIFFITHS' excellent article in the last number of *EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY* broaches a subject that has long stood in need of discussion. Here are a few reflections that may help to carry the discussion a little further. A fully scientific treatment of this subject is greatly to be desired.

One can be pious without philosophy and it is more important to be pious than to philosophize—as the writer of the *Imitation* so frequently reminds us; but none of us is unaffected by the broad philosophy of life (the *zeitgeist*, if you like) in which we live. More, this philosophy, whatever it may be, drives us, unwilling, to do things, to take up certain attitudes that may make our eternal salvation more or less difficult. If, for instance, we adopted the extreme attitude of some of the Desert Fathers towards the body, we modern folk should involve ourselves in almost insuperable difficulties. It is not unimportant, then, to attempt to unravel the philosophic strands that go to form the pattern for pious living.

Dom Bede Griffiths deals with the Platonic dynasty until the Scholastics and then shows how unsatisfactory Platonism is as a Christian philosophy. His criticism uses the weapons

¹ We give the last phrase as found in the two Byzantine Liturgies: " . . . and all us who partake of the one bread and the cup, do thou unite with one another in the communion of one Holy Spirit " etc. (Liturgy of St. Basil). " . . . so that it may be to all who receive it unto sobriety of soul, unto forgiveness of sins, unto communion of thy Holy Spirit, unto the fulness of the Kingdom," etc. (Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom).

of St. Thomas and perhaps not all Platonists will be pleased. The whole question of the relations between Platonism, Aristoteleanism and Thomism is very complex and fraught with danger for the amateur. St. Thomas was not anything so superficial as merely to be anti-Plato and pro-Aristotle, nor is Thomism merely baptized Aristoteleanism. He rethought, criticized and occasionally rejected Aristotle. (It is not so much a question, he said, of what Aristotle taught exactly as whether he was right), and (through St. Augustine) he took in much of Platonism (exemplary ideas in God) which again he moulded to his own purposes. It is precisely those parts that he apparently found indigestible that have been troublesome since. On the question of the relation of the soul to the body I doubt whether any Platonist could reject the main truth of Dom Bede's strictures, though a scholar like Professor A. E. Taylor¹ might make one or two reservations. However, what I would try and establish is the connection between the broad platonic tradition and modern piety.

It seems to me that the line of platonic evolution is somewhat as follows. First, St. Augustine, the *fons et origo* of the whole tradition, and then St. Gregory the Great whose diluted Augustinianism became the pattern of Christian piety. The somewhat enigmatical John Scotus Erigena must not be forgotten, though his influence was more intellectual than practical. With him may be put Pseudo-Dionysius from whom the Middle Ages took so much. But the next great name, St. Bernard, is really a turning point for the history of Christian piety. He not only summed up magisterially the whole Augustino-Gregorian tradition but distilled in the alembic of his poetical genius the obscure desires and longings of his own age.² Whatever may be the nuances of scholarly opinion it must be admitted that St. Bernard revealed in striking fashion to his own and subsequent ages the beauty of Christ's humanity. St. Bernard had nothing but contempt for philosophy which he thought dangerous, but he himself was the supreme type of the neo-platonic-Augustinian tradition. For him the will, *voluntas*, was everything and the *bonum* which to him was concrete, God, is the supreme object of life. Mere intellectual apprehension of being or good or God was useless in that it contributed nothing towards salvation. The whole effort of men, the *unum necessarium*,

¹ For this and much of the above, see Prof. Taylor's excellent lecture *St. Thomas as a Philosopher* in the Sexcentenary Lectures on St. Thomas published in 1925 (Oxford).

² Something stirred in the soul of twelfth century man, we do not know what exactly, but St. Bernard and *L'Amour Courtois* and a marvellous fresh lyrical poetry are signs of a profound revolution.

was the purification of the will from concupiscence until it was re-formed and reflected once more the image of God. For St. Bernard man is like to God chiefly in his will.¹ It is easy to see that, on such a philosophy, tremendous emphasis will be laid on the will in the business of salvation and since the will moves *out* towards its object and since the rôle of the intellect is reduced to insignificance, external means, Christ's human life, His example, love, exhortation, etc., will play a preponderant part in the Christian life. This is indeed what happened. St. Bernard is the first to preach on the humanity of Christ in accents that are "modern." Indeed, his sermons are the remote prototype of the bulk of hortatory sermons that emanate from our pulpits every week.² What St. Gregory had begun in giving a practical, Roman, bias to piety St. Bernard perfected and brought to completion.

The next great revolution in Christian thought was the Aristotelean-Thomistic. With what opposition this met in the Middle Ages everyone is aware, and I believe that the Thomist synthesis was never fully or even adequately assimilated by the Middle Ages. It may have come too late, though the real tragedy is that the intellectual effort of the thirteenth century was so short-lived. However that may be, it never exercised that influence on practical Christian life that it ought to have done,³ and the old Augustinian tradition in piety continued. This can be seen very clearly in the writings and practices of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Even in mystical writings (e.g., *Revelations of Divine Love*, Bl. Henry Suso) there is a tremendous emphasis on the human personality of Christ and especially on His sufferings. In the popular poems and carols of the period the tendency reaches a climax. In some quarters there seems to have been almost a hatred of the flesh and the sad twisted Christs are symbols of it. With this may be coupled the popular preaching of St. Bernardine of Siena and his devotion to the Holy Name; and St. Vincent Ferrer with his strange apocalyptic doctrines and flagellating followers. We see in Louis XI the piety of St. Louis IX become superstition and in general great emphasis on external means of salvation, pilgrimages, beads, medals, even the intense concern for indulgences, alms-giving, foundations of various sorts (cf. *Paston Letters*—a very bourgeois society where piety is perpetually mixed with the clank of

¹ Cf. Gilson, *La Théologie Mystique de Saint Bernard* (Paris 1934).

² This is not to say St. Bernard would have been flattered by the pale imitations of his style that *we* perpetrate.

³ There is of course the profound influence it exercised on St. Catherine of Siena to be seen in her Dialogues, but that was hardly typical and even Dominicans (e.g. Eckhart) seem at times to have returned to neo-platonism.

money) and all the rest of the practices and customs of the fifteenth century which are sometimes called "typically Catholic."¹

It would be insulting to say that the *Canticle of the Sun* was Aristotelean or even "Thomistic"²; it was simply Christian. But it was admirably balanced and it would be amusing, and perhaps instructive, to hear the ancient neo-platonists (Plotinus, for instance) pronounce upon it. Nevertheless, given the Franciscan mission which was pre-eminently practical, the rectification of the will in people already Christians, it is not surprising that the Franciscans continued the Augustinian tradition. St. Bonaventure remained an Augustinian and by the prestige of his sanctity and learning did much to continue the tradition.³ Nor is it without significance that Scotus, that subtle philosopher and opponent of Thomism, was a voluntarist. Scotus is perhaps a difficult figure to place and much work needs to be done on the sources of his knowledge and upon the exact interpretation of his doctrines, but as I have no scholarly reputation to hazard, I like to hold that Augustinian-platonism was not without its influence in his intellectual formation. Certain it is that his occasional anti-intellectualism (e.g., in the proofs for the existence of God) and his voluntarism have not been without effect upon subsequent thinkers. In a sense he forms a bridge between pre- and post-reformation theology and he often seems to have attracted Jesuit theologians. This can be seen in Suarez (who, if I remember rightly, quotes Scotus in the very business of the proofs of the existence of God), and my suspicion (it is hardly more) that platonism, Scotus and Suarez are congenial one to another receives some confirmation from a modern Jesuit, Fr. Gerard Manley Hopkins, who was a Platonist and found Scotus peculiarly attractive.⁴

On the other hand, it would seem at first sight that Molinism, with its emphasis on the human element, does not fit into this scheme. It seems opposed to the Platonist flight from the flesh. But the precise point about Molinism is its emphasis not so much on human nature as on the human *will* whose

¹ Not that any one of these practices was superstitious or unorthodox (although Indulgences got out of hand, so to say). Far from it, but the *emphasis* on these things was unhealthy.

² Of course it came before St. Thomas in time.

³ I do not, of course, suggest anything so silly as that St. Bonaventure was a platonist *because* he was a Franciscan. No doubt he was one by conviction, but he evidently found Augustinian-Platonism was congenial to him. The two just "fitted" that's all.

⁴ *The Notebooks and Papers of Gerard Manley Hopkins*, ed. by House (O.U.P., 1937). See e.g., "On the Origin of Beauty: a Platonic Dialogue"; and several references up and down the book to Scotus.

function in the business of salvation everyone will admit Molina threw into high relief. It is this emphasis on the will that brings Molinism and the Jesuit tradition into the line platonic-augustinian-scotist. Since the will is so important, all means must be found to get the will working properly, and this, it seems to me (I speak foolishly, perhaps, as one less wise) is the main purpose of the Exercises of St. Ignatius. There is in them a tremendous emphasis on the will and they are indeed a wonderful piece of machinery to rouse the will, to rectify it and to direct it to its proper end, God. This means, then, that apart from the perhaps remoter influence of theology, this Christian platonism is at the heart of the Jesuit tradition and we are not surprised that it issued in the sixteenth century, as in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, into a rich growth of popular devotions. Indeed, the Jesuits continued much of the work of the Franciscans.¹ Devotion to the Holy Name was, naturally enough, taken over by them, devotion to the Sacred Heart and many others have been propagated by them. In these things, as in the Middle Ages, there is the same emphasis on the humanity of Christ, on the love-motive, on everything that can solicit the will to act rightly.

Now it seems to me that this is the atmosphere in which we most of us were brought up. For most people it represents Catholic life, Catholic piety, the sort of thing we are expected to do and the way we are expected to act. Yet it will be immediately obvious that the Thomist synthesis plays little part in it.² The great ideas of the prevenience of God, of the transcendence of God, the "communal," *i.e.* the liturgical, aspect of Christianity, the sacramental aspect in its deepest connotation, the close body-soul relation in the human composite, the social aspect, none of these things have ever really formed an integral part of this "platonic" tradition of piety. *They have never been lived* by the majority of the faithful. The great chance of our generation, it seems to me, is to take that synthesis, even to widen it by taking in all that is good from the other tradition and, most of all, to live by it. This has already been begun by the Liturgical Movement, but much remains to be done.³

The purpose of this article was not so much to formulate a criticism as to state a fact, yet, at the risk of being accused

¹ I have often speculated as to the influence, if any, of Franciscanism upon St. Ignatius. There are several striking similarities—and dissimilarities!

² In so far as Thomism is part of Christian doctrine it has, of course, been part of any tradition of Christian piety but the necessary *emphasis* has sometimes been lacking. That is all I wish to say.

³ Cf. Dom Theodore Wesseling in *Magnificat*, Vol. II, No. 11, Jan., 1940

of being anti- or pro- something, the effects of the platonic tradition of piety may be underlined to emphasise the practical importance of the question. The emphasis placed on the will has undoubtedly led to an unduly moralistic view of Christianity. The will has to be kept in blinkers and must be surrounded by all sorts of checks, prohibitions and safeguards. The free movement of the spirit enriched with grace and by its inner strength able to vanquish evil, this is a concept that does not appear very clearly in the platonic tradition.¹ Well, this constant hammering of the will has had some curious results. The adolescent revolts against this excessive moralism. He has just begun to feel he is a *person* and he finds the exercise of his mind (partly) frustrated.² He wants to know the *why* of the moral law, why, in fact, sin is sin. He does not refuse discipline but he wants to know it is reasonable. He wants to co-operate with *mind* and will in the external discipline that he sees to be necessary. A mere flogging of the will just makes him rebellious. He has an instinctive realisation of the intimate body-soul relation and wants to bring the resources of his whole personality to bear in the moral struggle.³ Further, he does not always respond to the love-motive (especially when it appears in hymns under the guise of "Sweet Heart" . . . K.T.A.!) which he may (secretly) think sloppy or unreal. In any case and in every context he is shy of the word "love." But he can usually be moved to act if he is shown the reasonableness of things. And in the matter of love I have known youths get into a hopeless mess because love (in religion) had been presented to them primarily as a matter of emotion—at least, *that* is the impression prayers, hymns and pedagogues had left upon them.

In an entirely different sphere, this stressing of the will has had unhappy results. With moralism came emphasis upon the individual and a consequent splintering (in idea) of the organic unity of the Church. The individual is left alone to work out his salvation in fear and trembling. The effort of his will must be tremendous and he begins to be fearful. Couple this with moralism with its external checks and balances, with its legalism, and you have scruples as the result. One does not remember hearing much about scruples

¹ Of course it is there and of course, again, there is no question of un-orthodoxy. I am trying (dangerous task) to weigh emphases, almost *nuances*!

² It is not just a question of apologetics, etc. He gets *that*.

³ As an illustration of this, I remember having a furious argument with a boy of 16 about the immortality of the soul. At the end of hours of argument by accident I discovered his real objection was to a Cartesian angel-man type. I settled the whole business by a simple explanation of the union of the soul with the body, according to St. Thomas.

in the Middle Ages : they have become a pest since the Reformation.¹

There are other effects, too, but perhaps I have said enough (more than enough !) to show that the implicit philosophy of piety is very important for good and for ill, and it will be clear that the Thomist-liturgical *weltanschauung* can supply certain very necessary correctives to the platonist tradition.

(Final reflexion : it is curious that another stream of Platonism, Plotinus and his followers, including possibly Eckhart, developed an exaggeratedly intellectual tradition. It all comes of emphasizing different elements in Plato. Needless to say, *neither* tradition is anything but a travesty of historic Platonism).

J. D. CRICHTON.

THE ARMENIAN MEKHITARIST BENEDICTINES²

THE youngest offshoot of the Benedictine Order before the French Revolution struck its roots on Eastern soil, among the Armenian Catholics, and that soil has proved to be a very congenial one indeed. The Mekhitarist Congregation, or rather Order, was founded by an Armenian for the Armenians, and is best

¹ Other factors have no doubt contributed towards this, but they do not affect the main truth of my contention. Moreover proof can be obtained of both points by a study of any family brought up for two or three generations on moralistic piety. Why do boys of these families so often become "reprobates"? Why does one so often meet scrupulous tendencies in these families?

² BIBLIOGRAPHY.—Harvutian Aukerian. *Compendiose notizie sulla Congregazione de' Monaci Armeni Mechitaristi di Venezia*, Venice, 1819. In Armenian and Italian. Alexander Goode. *A Brief account of the Mekhitaristic Society founded on the Island of San Lazzaro*. Venice. Printed at the press of the same Armenian Academy, 1826, 24 pp. in 4. The dedicatory-preface is signed by Alex. Goode. P. B. Sargissan. *La Congregazione Mechitarista e le sue benemeritenze nell' Oriente e nell' Occidente*, in *Rivista Storica Benedettina*, 1906, pp. 161-183; 334-363; 560-568; 1907, pp. 253-281. Nurikhan-McQuillan. *The Life and Times (1660-1750) of the Servant of God, abbot Mechitar, founder of the Armenian Mechitarists of Venice (San Lazzaro)*. With 55 illustrations and 50 documents. Written in Italian by Fr. Minas Nurikhan. Translated by Rev. John McQuillan, D.D. St. Lazarus Island, Venice, 1915. Thomas Nediani. *I grandi refugi dello spirito : l'Isola di San Lazzaro degli Armeni*, Venice, Isola di San Lazzaro, 1926. Fr. Gabriel Nahapetian, monk of San Lazzaro. *L'Isola di San Lazzaro a Venezia e i Mechitaristi*. In *L'Italia Benedettina*, edited by Abbot P. Lugano, Rome, 1929, pp. 596-610. Dom J. Pérez de Urbel, O.S.B. *Pedro Mekitar, La Luz de Armenia*, in *Semblanzas Benedictinas*, Vol. II, Madrid, 1930, pp. 319-323. Donald Attwater, *The Mekhitarist Press*, in *Pax*, Prinknash, April 1933, pp. 9-11. And the two excellent articles *Mekhitar* and *Mekhitarists* by Dom J. C. Almond in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*.

described as a grafting of the Western type of Religious life, with its twofold ideal of prayer and organised activities, on to the traditional Eastern monachism, in which the life of prayer is not usually accompanied by any serious methodical work ; and that not in order to supplant but in order to enrich the essentially Eastern character of Armenian Catholicism.

The Rule of St. Benedict was already known to the Armenians and had been held by them in high reverence since the Middle Ages, when it was translated into their language by St. Nerses Lambronazi (†1198), Armenian Archbishop of Tarsus, chief actor "in the events which led up to the reunion of Little Armenia with the Holy See."¹

The founder of this new Benedictine branch was Peter Manuk, born in 1676 at Sebaste (Sivas) in Lesser Armenia. In 1691 he became a monk in the cloister of the Holy Cross near Sebaste, and in doing so he had no other motive than the desire to serve God according to the ideals of Eastern monachism. It was now that he acquired the surname of Mekhitar,² "the Comforter." But the quiet, passive life of the Eastern monk did not satisfy Mekhitar's craving to exert himself in the service of the Church. His vocation to a life of active Christian service within the monastic state was beginning to take definite shape, and soon, without abandoning his religious habit, he left the monastery and set out in quest of his ideal : a monastic life of retirement and prayer combined with apostolic activities. In his travels he met an Armenian missionary who was fully conversant with Western culture and monachism, and this meeting gave him the key to his life's work. He decided to devote himself henceforward to the introduction of Western influence and ideas into Armenia, and from now onwards it was his ambition to found a new Armenian monastic Congregation, but he attained his ambition only at the cost of many trials and misunderstandings.

In 1696 he was ordained and in 1699 graduated as a Doctor (Vartaped). About this time (1698) he gathered around him several young Armenians who were desirous of leading a life of prayer and penance and who shared his own noble ideals of an Armenian Apostolate. In 1701 he formed the first community of his new Congregation at Constantinople. It was composed of ten young men who, like himself, had obtained a doctor's degree. Two years later the first monastery was established at Modon in the Morea. These first years were full of perils and escapes from the hostility of their

¹ Donald Attwater, *A Dictionary of Saints*, 1938, pp. 219-220.

² Spelt also : Machitar, Mechithar, Mekitar, Mekhithar, Mchitar, Mochtor. The spelling of the name on the Index at the British Museum is Mekhitar—which I have followed here.

countrymen such as would have discouraged less determined souls, but Mekhitar had the gift of inspiring his disciples with his own overflowing enthusiasm. It was at Modon that in 1712 the Ven. Founder was invited by the Holy See to choose between the Rules of St. Benedict, of St. Augustine and of St. Basil, and Mekhitar himself writes : " having been given permission to choose between the rules of SS. Basil, Augustine and Benedict, we chose the last mentioned unanimously as being known to Armenians for many a century."¹ The choice of the Rule was a determining factor in the spirit of the Mekhitarists as well as in the trend of their activities. It should be remembered that precisely at this time the Maurists were in the hey-day of their literary achievement and renown—Mabillon died in 1707—and we may trace back to this fact the subsequent amazing success of Mekhitar and his followers in the same field. Thus it was that the old Benedictine tree shot forth one of its branches to the East. The Mekhitarists, however, retained the habit common to the Eastern monks—wide-sleeved black gown, cap with veil—and, like them, they grew the beard. Moreover, as in all other Benedictine Congregations, supplementary Constitutions regulated the régime, policy, and different works of the Institute. In 1712 Pope Clement XI formally approved the new Congregation and nominated Mekhitar as its abbot for life.

Shortly after, a severe blow imperilled the very existence of the Congregation. In 1715 the Turks captured Modon, and Mekhitar and his community fled to Venice, where in 1717 they were given the small Island of San Lazzaro between the Giudecca and the Lido. Here the saintly Founder lived for the remainder of his life. He died on April 27th in the odour of sanctity, having stamped his Congregation with his own Benedictine ideal of prayer and apostolic labour for, and among, the scattered and persecuted Armenians. The process for the Beatification and Canonization of the Servant of God was opened in 1844 and resumed in 1901.²

* * *

During the last two centuries the Mekhitarist monks have fruitfully carried on the programme of their saintly Founder. They have never been numerically strong, but they made up for their lack of numbers by efficiency and thoroughness. They soon spread throughout Armenia, Persia, Turkey, the Caucasus and the Crimea, and opened schools and colleges wherever they made a permanent settlement.

¹ Nurikhan-McQuillan, op. cit., p. 155 ; see also p. 153.

² Dom A. Zimmermann, O.S.B., *Kalendarium Benedictinum*, T. II, * Metten. 1934, p. 117.

In 1773 a house was opened at Trieste, which was eventually transferred to Vienna (1811). The imperial policy of the Austrian "King-Sacristan" made necessary a severance from the Mother-house at Venice, and gradually two Mekhitarist Congregations were formed: one with the principal centre at Venice—*Congregatio Mechitaristica Veneta*, and the other with the Mother-house at Vienna—*Congregatio Mechitaristica Vindobonensis*. Both suffered much during the Great War and from the subsequent political upheavals in the near East, but they are fast recovering the ground lost.¹

The Mekhitarists of Venice, besides the Mother-house at San Lazzaro, have five college-residences, namely,² the Armenian College of Moorat-Raphael, also at Venice, and others at Constantinople, Paris, Aleppo and Alexandria. They work also at two permanent missions: at Baylan, near Alexandria, and at Alexandria. Finally, after the Great War, they opened a central House of Studies in Rome, on the Aventine Hill and close to the International Benedictine College of Sant' Anselmo, where the young clerics of the Congregation follow their philosophical and theological course.³ For several years they have had as Prefect a professed monk of Genoa, Dom Pius Alfonso, well known throughout Italy as one of the leading Benedictine writers on the Liturgy. The Abbot General of the Congregation is elected for life and invested with full power: he is usually given episcopal consecration and status. The novices at their profession add a fourth vow to devote themselves to missionary work. Beneath their cloak they wear a cross of red cloth, symbol of their readiness to shed their blood for the Catholic cause.

The Congregation of Vienna has had an Abbot General of its own since 1903. Besides the Mother-house of Vienna, they have a parish and college at Constantinople,⁴ a mission with a pro-gymnasium and an elementary school at Cairo, a mission at Bucharest—the residence of the Administrator Apostolic for the Armenian Catholics, who is a Mekhitarist monk—another mission at Novisad in Jugoslavia, and another at Cavalla in Greece.

* * *

The two Congregations have rendered yeoman service to the cause of Armenian Catholicism, and the list of their

¹ Perhaps this statement has now to be modified with regard to the Congregation of Vienna.

² From information kindly supplied by Fr. Mesrobio Glanascian, Mekhitarist of Venice, 1 Oct. 1936.

³ Their names and respective courses are listed in the *Litterae Annales* of the College of St. Anselm.

⁴ From information directly supplied by Fr. Moses Srabian, Mekhitarist of Venice, 1^o Nov. 1936.

enterprises during the last two centuries entitles them to a high place in the annals of the Benedictine Order. Their record as writers, missionaries and educationalists has few parallels in Catholic history. It has been mainly by cultural means that the Mekhitarists have aimed at spreading the Catholic Faith among the Armenians. With amazing forethought the Ven. Mekhitar himself set up a printing-press at Constantinople in the very earliest days of the Institute and there he published his maiden work—an Armenian translation of the *Imitation of Christ*. The press was set up again at Venice and for two centuries it has never ceased to produce new books. These works run into several thousands of volumes.

Naturally by far the greater number are of a religious character. Fr. Gabriel Nahapetian gives the following summary of their activities as disseminators of religious literature¹ : "In considering the works produced by the Mekhitarist press (of Venice) we may classify them in four groups—religious, national (patriotic), scientific and Belles Lettres. The Mekhitarists have published volumes on Dogmatic and Moral Theology, Lives of the Saints, Church History, Catechisms, biblical commentaries, homilies, sermons, and manuals for preachers, controversy against heretics and schismatics both in defence of Catholic doctrine and in refutation of the false teaching of innovators, Protestant and other—books of devotion or for spiritual reading and prayer books for all ages and conditions."

The range of publications in the other subject-groups mentioned above has been similarly exhaustive ; in fact, one can say without fear of over-statement, that the Mekhitarist monks have brought into being a complete Armenian Literature, either by original contributions or by translations of well nigh all the foreign Classics—Greek, Latin, English, Italian, Spanish, French, German, Russian.

Perhaps it will not be amiss, if, before concluding, we mention a few Mekhitarist writers and their works. Fr. John Baptist Ankherian (d. 1820) edited in 1818 the *Chronicle* of Eusebius, in collaboration with Cardinal Mai. Fr. Michael Ciancianz (d. 1823) wrote a history of the Armenian Church—*Historia Ecclesiae Armenae*—especially valuable on account of its documentation, and an Armenian Commentary on the Psalms in ten volumes. Fr. Adeodatus Babikian (d. 1825), one of the founders of the Congregation of Vienna, *inter alia*, translated Billuart into Armenian. Fr. Gabriel Avedikian (d. c. 1830) was a very competent biblical exegete. Fr.

¹ In *L'Italia Benedettina*, op. cit., 606–608.

Arsenius Pacraduni (d. 1866), a celebrated polyglot, discovered and edited the Armenian text of Ecclesiasticus and was responsible for the latest Armenian version of the Bible. Fr. John Auger (d. 1852) was a noted patristic scholar. Fr. Pascal Auger (d. 1855), John's brother, student of philology, translated into 36 languages 24 short prayers of St. Nerses "the Gracious"—Glaetzi (d. 1173). The languages include Irish, Greenlandic, Icelandic, Malayan, Serbian, Turkish, Chinese and Ethiopic. Moreover, he compiled the first French-Armenian and English-Armenian Dictionaries, and in 1816 taught Armenian to his great friend and admirer, Lord Byron.

* * *

The learned and literary achievements of the Mekhitarist Benedictines, great as they are, should always be considered in connexion with their educational and missionary undertakings: otherwise we fail to reach a full assessment of their contribution to Armenian Catholicism. One may say with truth that organised monastic work, under the auspices of St. Benedict's Rule, has been as signally blessed in the East as in the West. It is not mere rhetoric to say that the Mekhitarist Fathers have placed their compatriots lastingly in their debt; they have inspired them with a virile pride in their destiny as a race; they have kept together the scattered remnants of their nation; they have firmly attached them to the Catholic Faith and to the Roman See; they have trained their youth, they have preserved or disinterred their ancient literature and translated for them the whole range of the world's masterpieces in all branches of learning. They have been called with good reason the Saviours of the Armenian race, and all this they have accomplished as faithful followers of their Founder, who to this day is lovingly called by his people "The Light of Armenia."

DOM ROMANUS RIOS.

THE MELKITES AND THE MOHAMMEDANS

THE Melkites to-day are the Christians of the Byzantine Rite living in the near East: Syria, the Lebanon, Egypt, Palestine, Transjordan. The Catholics depend on the Patriarch of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem and now use the Arabic language in their liturgy.

Exclusive of the important immigration in America, there are about 700,000, of whom nearly half are Catholics.

The Melkites and the Mohammedans 65

They have been called Melkites since 451 A.D. in opposition to the Monophysites. This title which literally means : " of the king " was applied to the Catholics, in other words to those who had admitted the true faith defined in the Council of Chalcedon which was supported by the Byzantine Emperor (Basileus Marcian, husband of St. Pulcheria).

In the Near East they were in the minority. Then, to save their faith, they adopted the whole Greek liturgy of St. John Chrysostom as practised in Constantinople. This in fact is an harmonic composition of the former liturgies of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem.

Following upon the decrease and the decay of the Byzantine Empire, these Eastern native populations gradually forsook the Greek language, and until the sixteenth century used Syriac, then the vernacular tongue, as the liturgical language. From the sixteenth century, first privately and soon officially, the language of their conquerors, in other words the language of the Koran, Arabic, was chiefly used and became so predominant that all other languages were dropped, according to the principle of the Byzantine Rite that one ought to pray in a living and intelligible language.

Thus the Melkite liturgy can be said completely in Arabic just as it was first said in Greek, and afterwards in Slavonic, in Rumanian, in Esthonian, etc. . . . There is no exception made for the Consecration as is the case with the Maronites, the Copts, and the Syriacs who also now use Arabic.

Therefore we get this fact : a people living among Mohammedans, belonging to the same stock, speaking the same language, praying in the same tongue, singing the Gospel, calling our Lord on the altar in their common tongue, calling upon, not a foreign, but an Arabic Christ—so to speak—for the Arabian population. Is not this Church designed by Providence for a special vocation and task ?

On the other hand, let us remember and stress that the Melkite rite is connected with the whole of Byzantine Christianity ; its roots being fixed in a deep and vast tradition of piety, of beauty and of Catholicism.

These intimate connections exist both in ideas and in facts, in the past and in the present.

Mr. Habib Zayat, the scientific specialist on Melkite history, possesses a number of documents illustrating the relations between the Melkites and the Mohammedans in the Middle Ages, how they intermingled and how the Mohammedan authors always considered the Melkites as Catholics in spite of the material separation from Rome. Up to the present

they have been called simply " Catholics " by the people, to distinguish them from numerous other communities.

To-day the Melkites, perhaps more than the other eastern Christians are everywhere immersed, so to speak, among Mohammedans and everywhere they seem to be in their native country, for they are not localized as are the Maronites in the Lebanon, the Copts in Egypt, etc., but they are Palestinians in Palestine, Egyptians in Egypt, Syrians in Syria, etc. With this imminent seed of Christianity spread in Islamic lands, Our Lord is at home.

The missionary spirit among the Melkites long remained dormant. They did not give due consideration to the fact that the surrounding Mohammedans were their neighbours in the evangelical sense. They rather remembered bitterly the time of persecution when their forefathers were killed or exiled or their property confiscated for the sake of the Christian faith.

So the Melkite priests carried on their ministry, but inside their churches and among a few Melkite families depending on them. But recently with the help of Rome, we began a revival and broadened our outlook: we look upon the Orthodox field of our separated brethren and the Mohammedan minarets. . . . We begin to be aware of the Islamic religion which formerly was quite ignored. Knowledge is the way of love and the impetus to action.

Spreading the Melkite liturgy is the best way of presenting Our Lord to the Mohammedan mind. If by chance any one of them attends this liturgy he is deeply struck and is so moved that he comes again. The advantage of the Melkite position here consists in the attractiveness of the Arabic Holy Mass. I noticed that at Damascus, at Cairo and in the Transjordan, especially in the Transjordan where the Christian and Mohammedan standards of life are so alike.¹

In the Sahara Desert, at El Abiod, the Little Brothers of the Sacred Heart, disciples of Fr. Charles de Foucauld use some of the Melkite anthems and prayers and are very popular among the Bedouin. The Melkite Missionaries of St. Paul who were founded 35 years ago at Harissa-Lebanon for the work of bringing back the Melkite Orthodox to the Catholic family would be able to labour in the Mohammedan field and more easily than any western congregations.² For that reason a French missionary has already become a Paulist and adopted the Melkite rite in order to approach nearer, by the

¹ See *La Transjordanie Melkite*, by H. Ayrout, S. J. Xaveriana, Louvain, 1935, 32 pp.

² See *Les Missionnaires de St. Paul*, Harissa, Lebanon, 1936, 90 pp. A book well illustrated and printed in their own press. Free.

Arabic Holy Mass to the Arabic Moslem world. Jesuits have also begun.

We are preparing and waiting and hoping. . . .

H. H. AYROUT, S.J.,
(Priest of the Melkite Byzantine Rite).

EDITOR'S NOTE.—We quote the following from the life of Charles de Foucauld, trusting that Melkites will do likewise.

"Such isolated missionaries as I am are very few. Their rôle is to prepare the way, so that the missions which replace them will find a friendly and trustful population, souls somewhat prepared for Christianity, and if possible a few Christians. We must get ourselves accepted by the Musulmans, become their sure friends, to whom they come when in doubt or trouble; on whose affection, wisdom and justice they can absolutely rely. It is only when we arrive at this point that we shall come to do good to their souls. . . . There are very few isolated missionaries fulfilling this pioneer work; I wish there were many of them; every parish priest in Algeria, Tunis, or Morocco, every military chaplain, every pious Catholic layman, could be one. The Government forbids the secular clergy to carry on anti-Musulman propaganda: but it is not a question of open and more or less noisy propaganda—friendly intercourse with many natives, tending to induce Musulmans slowly, gently and silently to come closer to Christians and become their friends. This nobody can be forbidden to do. Every parish priest in our colonies could exert himself to train his male and female parishioners to be Priscillas and Aquilas. There is quite a loving and discreet propaganda to be carried on among the infidel natives—a propaganda which requires as great kindness, love and prudence, as when we wish to bring a relation who has lost the Faith back to God."

REVIEW OF REVIEWS

EDITOR'S NOTE.—We intend in this review of certain periodicals of the past year not so much to criticize their contents as to give our readers an idea of current opinion on Eastern Church matters. Comment, of course, will be necessary on occasion.

CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

Irenikon.

Orientalia Christiana Periodica.

Echos d'Orient.

Zeitschrift für Aszese u. Mystik.

Theological Studies. New York. This is the first number.
February, 1940.

Acta Academiae Velehradensis, 1939. Fasc. 1 and 2.

We have received only the first two numbers of the *Acta* for 1939. They contain further chapters of the exhaustive and very interesting treatise by Dr. J. C. Jaros, C.S.S.R., on Matrimonial Impediments among the Uniate Bulgarians. In these chapters Dr. Jaros traces the evolution of the Bulgarian matrimonial law and judiciously discusses such questions as the part played by Latin influences at various periods and by

old pre-Christian national customs. Fr. G. Hofmann, S.J., continues his account of the Council of Florence with a number of documents illustrating the activities of J. de Montenegro, O.P., at the Council, and others showing the composition of the various commissions of the Council. Dr. Vajs contributes an article, copiously illustrated with photographs of the manuscript, in which he discusses how much of the fourteenth century Vatican Glagolitic missal was taken from the palaeoslav Sacramentary of the ninth century. There is also an account of the life of Mgr. Leopold Precan, primate of Moravia and president of the Velehrad Congresses, who celebrated his sacerdotal golden jubilee last July. Under the title *Varia* are included: an account of the *Dies pro Oriente Christiano* held at Olomouc in February 1939, and notably of addresses commemorating the anniversaries of the conversion of St. Vladimir and of the Council of Florence, by Mgr. Jemelka and Dr. Cinek respectively; an account of the work of the Dominicans in Bohemia; the letter of Pius XII to Cardinal Tisserant and the *Osservatore Romano* account of the Roman celebrations on the occasion of the anniversary of St. Vladimir.

DOM THEODORE RICHARDSON.

L'Oriente Cristiano e L'Unità della Chiesa. Redazione: Piazza S. Maria Maggiore, 7, Roma. *Bollettino Ufficiale della Eparchia di Piana dei Greci.* Pubblicazione Bimestrale.

We welcome these two bi-monthly publications which began to appear last year, 1939. They are symptomatic of the increased interest now taken by the Catholics of Italy and Sicily in the problems of re-union.

L'Oriente Cristiano is intended as an introduction to Eastern affairs and is written in a popular style. In its first number the Editorial is an act of homage to the newly elected Pope, Pius XII, and prints one of his allocutions wherein the Holy Father speaks of his earnest prayer and great desire for re-union, and also of his solicitude for those not yet within the One Fold.

The next number gives an able historical summary of the relations between the Roman and the Oriental Churches from the founding of Constantinople (Byzantium). It tells of the activity of the Papacy in the fight between Christianity and Islamism, of the Crusades, and of the salvation of Europe from the Turk at Lepanto and Vienna. It reminds us of the great sacrifices made by successive Popes for this end, and of their continual efforts for unity with the Dissident Churches.

The May-June issue gives a vivid account of the life of St. Vladimir and of his prodigious labours on behalf of the Slav peoples. This is in connection with the celebrations in honour of the 950th anniversary of the saint's death, and is from the pen of Cardinal Pellegrinetti.

Dom Placid de Meester contributes a most helpful translation of the ceremony of consecration of a bishop according to the Byzantine rite.

The July-August number contains a timely article by Abba Jalon-Socquer about the faith of the Ethiopian Church. It is shown that this Church is not infected by the Monophysite heresy, but that it has always subscribed to the Council of Chalcedon. The apparent discrepancy is the fault of ambiguity of terminology: in point of fact it retains the true Catholic Faith.

There is also a useful translation of the Liturgy of St. James the Less, together with notes on the same.

An account of a lecture by Professor Gregoire, which is taken from the *Osservatore Romano*, is most illuminating. The Professor shows that it was not the dogmatic question (sc. the Filioque clause) but the internal discord of the Byzantine Churches which was responsible for the schism.

No. 5, September—October, 1939. The Christological belief, and the apostolate, as well as the life story of SS. Cyril and Methodius are ably set forth in an interesting article by Cardinal Pellegrinetti.

The final number, October—December, 1939, provides abundant evidence of the awakening interest which is everywhere shown throughout Italy in Eastern affairs.

The *Bollettino di Piana dei Greci* is the diocesan magazine of the newly constituted diocese of that name. A special feature of this publication is the inclusion of the text, or a translation of those Acts of the Apostolic See which relate to Eastern affairs. As in the other periodical, the increasing activity and growing interest evinced by many Catholics in the question of re-union is amply illustrated. As is natural the *Bollettino* is principally concerned with the work and aims of the Bishop and people of Piana dei Greci.

DOM WILFRID EMERY.

NON-CATHOLIC REVIEWS.

Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift.

Nebesky Chlep (The Heavenly Bread).

Stephen Graham's New Letter about the Orthodox Churches in War Time. No. 1, March, 1940. Published monthly by the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association.

This is very welcome, we will treat of its matter later.—
EDITOR.

Sobornost. March—December, 1939. (Nos. 17—20).

This year's issue of *Sobornost* is full of much that is interesting. The September number is taken up almost entirely with papers read at High Leigh and one overflows into the December issue. In the March and June numbers there is an article by one of the younger students at the Russian Academy in Paris, A. D. Semenoff-Tian-Shansky; it is translated from the original article that appeared in *Put*. The article is entitled "Work, Creativity and Freedom." It is a penetrating but constructive criticism of what life has become for so many people in Europe:—"Life for the majority of Europeans, falls more and more into two categories: joyless labour and empty, fruitless leisure."

We think the writer would endorse this extract from E. I. Watkin's *A Philosophy of Form*:—"Contemplation therefore is profitable for all things, earthly and divine alike, for individual and social welfare. Man is indeed not primarily the talking or tool-making animal—these are but external expressions of his mental life—but the contemplative animal. The concepts he forms are discriminations of a contemplative intuition which they can never adequately render. To be human and to be contemplative is one and the same. In so far as an individual or a society is false to the primacy and order of contemplation, that man, that society is inhuman. That is why in various degrees the capitalist, the Fascist and the Communist societies are more or less inhuman." Our writer meets the problem in the same way, *e.g.*:—"to serve as a means to anything is to be a slave," but for the Christian, "means cease to be such directly they serve an exalted, and, still more, an absolute value"; and again, "at the foundation of every creative act there always lies a moment of conception and contemplation, because only God can create the truly new; all that is new in the creation of man is so only as revealed to him." The question is how to bring about a state of things in which people will cease to worship means in the place of values.

In dealing with economic problems he might be quoting Pius XI :—" It is surely time to realize that one of the evils of capitalism is not so much the existence of property-owners as the fact that there are too many wage-owners and too few property-owners." The article should be read and pondered on.

There are two other articles (or is it one?) that call for special mention, those of Dr. Zernov—" Obstacles and Opportunities " (in March), and " The Fellowship and its place in Reunion Work " (in December). In the first Dr. Zernov divides Christians to-day into three groups : those who hold the " absolutist " doctrine of the Church, and here he places the Roman Church ; those who hold the " relativist " doctrine of the Church, and these are mostly confined to liberal Protestants ; and the third, those who hold that " although the unity of the Church, being from God, can never be lost, yet the members of the Church can render this gift all but useless. . . . Nothing can deprive it of the unity which lies at its basis, though its members are guilty of sin so long as they fail to show the reality of this unity to the world." It is to this group that he assigns members of the Eastern Churches and of the Anglican Church. This statement, even as it stands, does not seem to us a satisfactory exposition of the Orthodox idea of the unity of the Church ; it is less so when compared with what he has to say about the " absolutists," viz., that they believe " not only that the Church is a divine institution, which has been provided by God Himself with a definitive form of government, discipline and worship, but that it never has digressed from this divine pattern. . . . The Church is not and cannot be divided."

As they are set out in the article the one statement seems to contradict the other, and although Dr. Zernov admits that some Orthodox hold the last mentioned view, one gathers that he considers it not in keeping with the views of the Orthodox members of the Fellowship. Here, however, we have other evidence which gainsays such a line of thought. Father Sergius Bulgakov is certainly clear in his views on the question of the unity of the Church and he is indeed a veteran member of the Fellowship. He says in his book *The Orthodox Church* : " There is only one true Church, the Orthodox Church. . . . Orthodoxy is that one true Church which preserves the continuity of life of the Church, that is, the unity of tradition. . . . Consequently it must be understood, first of all, that the unity of the Church means the true Church without spot : that it is unique on earth. But this does not deny to the churches (in the plural) a certain degree of the true

spirit of the Church" (Chapter IV, pp. 104—105). This is what has been described as "absolutist" and is quite in keeping with the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. We may also quote Father George Florovsky from an essay of his on Sobornost though it does not deal *ex professo* with Church unity: "*Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus*. All the categorical strength and point of this aphorism lies in its tautology. Outside the Church there is no salvation, because *salvation is the Church*." This is taken from a symposium of the Fellowship (*The Church of God*, p. 53). This attitude, we cannot help feeling, is fairly general among the Orthodox members of the Fellowship (we certainly hope so) nor do we think it is a hindrance but rather a help in the cause of "Church Reunion."

The second article of Dr. Zernov recounts the splendid work in the cause of reunion done by the Fellowship; and in spite of what has been left undone that might and ought to have been done, it is a splendid work. And the suggested St. Basil's House where missionaries for Unity will be trained is a thing to be greatly desired and indeed a matter for congratulation.

The whole of the September issue is mostly taken up with the papers read at High Leigh in July, 1939. The general subject of the Conference was Prophecy. The papers were as follows: *The Spirit of Prophecy* by Fr. Sergius Bulgakov. This was read by another since Fr. Sergius had only recently undergone a most serious and painful operation; his presence was profoundly missed; *The Church and the Believer* by the Rev. Dr. G. Rosendal of the Lutheran Church of Sweden; *The Prophet and the Church* by Dom Gregory Dix, Anglican Benedictine of Nashdom; *The Faith and the Theologian* by Fr. George Florovsky. This unfortunately was neither reported *verbatim* nor did the speaker use any manuscript, hence nothing was printed.

Father Bulgakov in his paper (it is only really a brief summary of his main points) contends that prophecy is an act of religious life, a *personal* meeting with God. He says: "it is essential however to distinguish, and even to contrast, prophecy as the general gift of the Holy Spirit finding expression in the capacity to receive revelation, and prophecy as actual revelation itself. Prophecy means therefore the general spirit-bearing quality of Christian humanity after Pentecost, capable in its human inspiration as creatures to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit and be inspired by it. Human inspiration thus becomes *divinely-human*." He links this up with the Sacrament of Confirmation. He also insists on a prophetic element in theology though he would not exaggerate it—it is a prophecy

to fathom divine things, to know God—hence a theologian can have a prophetic ministry.

Dr. Rosendal in his paper deals with the problem of dogma and faith. He maintained that in the Churches of the Reformation, *e.g.*, the Church of Sweden and the Church of England, owing to individualism in Pietism and Liberalism there was a great contrast between the dogma of the Church and the faith (belief) of the believer. He showed how the Confessional Documents of the Swedish Church taught the doctrine that Our Lady was the Mother of God, the doctrine of the Real Presence, but that very few of the Swedish clergy or people believed in these things. He argued that in the case of the Church of Rome and the Orthodox Churches the piety of the faithful may have overstepped the mark of right doctrine. And he pleaded that the "œcumenist" should first of all strive for the building up of right faith of his own people and interpreting the creed of other Churches by their official Confessional Documents and not by the belief of the people.

Father Dix gave a brilliant paper on "The Prophet and the Church"; his sub-title is "Dogma and the Mystical Body." To attempt to analyse it would be unfair; it must be read. He related the two titles to one another; he more or less identified poet (at least of the early tragic poetry of Athens) with prophet; he insisted that their message is dependent on contemporary dogma; and then in relation with the New Covenant he shows how the Church herself is now corporately the true Prophet and that there is a divine *magisterium* in the Church provided in a special prophetic organ, the Episcopate. Such are a few indications of his thesis.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

The Star of the East. June—November, 1939. (Nos. 1—2).

This is the journal of the newly founded Fellowship of St. Thomas and St. Paul whose special work is concerned with the reunion of the Churches of the East (*vid.*—EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY, October, 1939, p. 508).

The June number has three interesting articles about the revival of the Syrian Church in India. One reads of the great missionary work of Father Petros among the outcasts. Again one is struck by the success of the use of the ashram as a method of approach to the Indian and also the co-operation between a number of Anglican missionaries and the Syrian Christians. There seems to be here a future both for the Christianising of India and the preparation for reunion

along Catholic lines. We think Mar Ivanios should have been treated with greater charity.

In the November issue the articles are more varied. There is the description of the doing to death of the Metropolitan Vladimir of Kiev in 1918. An article on *The Jurisdiction of Orthodox Christendom*, by one Vassily James, is very interesting and is a sign of the growing internationalism of Orthodoxy; but much of what the writer claims as entirely Orthodox in the realm of art and building we would say was also Catholic. Catholicism is not confined to Latin mediaevalism.

Besides articles there is a great deal of useful information. We hope it will always have some articles dealing with the problem of the Church in India.

DOM BEDE WINSLOW.

(The other reviews will be dealt with in the next issue.—EDITOR).

NEWS AND COMMENTS

EDITOR'S NOTE.—We had been asked to publish this some time ago. We think this the most appropriate time.

THE SACRAMENT OF UNITY.

How can the Church Unity Octave continue to be effective?

For eight days ardent prayers have once again ascended to heaven from millions of Christian hearts, their intention being identical with that of our Redeemer as He went to His death: may "they all . . . be one, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee" (St. John xvii, 21). He whose Christian conscience has been aroused by the impelling power of Christ's great demand will feel obliged to continue praying for this grand intention still after the Octave is ended. But it is not only the individual who should continue this prayer—Christian communities also should frequently repeat the last prayer of our Lord with His disciples, imploring God to bring about the unity of His mystical body.

Perhaps the following suggestions will be welcomed by those who have this reunion at heart.

It was on a Thursday that Christ, our High Priest, offered up His prayer for unity. This is the day when special devotions are held in many churches in honour of the Most Blessed Sacrament, being, indeed, the day when it was first given to us. Since the faithful to some extent lack interest and understanding for these Eucharistic devotions, would it not be better to offer them up with the intention that mankind be

reunited in the faith, dedicating, in fact, each Thursday of the year to this great intention?

The Most Holy Sacrament of the Altar is, essentially, the "Sacrament of Unity."

At the Secret Prayers in the Mass of the Most Holy Sacrament, the Church prays: "We beseech Thee, O Lord, graciously to grant Thy Church the gifts of unity and peace, which are mysteriously expressed in this sacrificial oblation." Already in early Christian times, the Church Fathers indicate that in their origin the Eucharistic appearances are a symbol of unity. Bread, produced from many grains, and wine, the product of many grapes, become one food and one drink. And how much more does the partaking of the consecrated Eucharistic appearances in the holy feast of fellowship "symbolize the union of the faithful in the Lord" (Post Communion in the Mass: to end a schism). Furthermore (at the same place), this Eucharistic union has the power "to bring about unity within the Church"; for the participation in the body and blood of the Lord "builds up the mysterious edifice, of which Christ is the Head and we are the members." "For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread and of one chalice" (Communion) says the Church with St. Paul (1 Cor. x, 17). "Our souls being satisfied through the reception of the Easter Sacraments, we are infused with the spirit of love, becoming one in spirit" (Post Communion on Easter Sunday).

Thus the Most Holy Eucharist is in truth the "sacrament of unity," and there is verily a deep inner reason for the suggestion that Thursday, the day when this sacrament was first given to us, should be dedicated to the idea of the reunion of all in the faith. It is to be hoped that this idea will be particularly welcomed by religious orders, seminaries and other Church communities whose endeavour is to form their lives on a Eucharistic-liturgical basis. The "Holy Hour," observed by many Christians on Thursdays to commemorate the redeeming inner sufferings of our Lord upon the Mount of Olives, could well be conducted in this intention. There can be no doubt that Christ's prescience of future schisms in His mystical body added much to His spiritual sufferings.

After all, we are deeply aware of this great plea for reunion at every Eucharistic celebration. We pray, indeed, for peace and unity before Holy Communion at each Holy Mass, this being the same entreaty that ascended from millions of souls during the Church Unity Octave. We therefore consider that the preceding plea for peace (*Pax Domini sit semper vobiscum*) embraces all Christendom, and at the beginning

of the Canon we pray daily with particular fervour : “ . . . quam . . . adunare . . . digneris (vouchsafe to unite—Thy Church—throughout the world ”).

We also read in the Liturgy of the Eastern Churches often : “ let us pray for peace throughout the whole world, for the welfare of all holy Churches of God, and for the union of all.”

Thus the Eucharistic and liturgical movement of our times will grow into a great endeavour for reunion, and the irresistible power which emanates from the heart of the Redeemer in the Most Holy Sacrament draws all things to itself and leads to final unity.

PROFESSION OF FAITH FOR RUSSIANS.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—In the last issue we gave the translation of Mgr. Neveu's instructions to Army chaplains as to how to deal with Orthodox soldiers at the Front. Here we give the translation of the profession of Faith required of Russian Orthodox who seek reconciliation with the Church in normal times. The translation and following comments are made by the Rev. P. Dickinson, S.J.

This is a translation from the Slavonic-Russian text : I have not seen the Latin text.

This formula of profession of faith differs in several details from the general one for Orientals (which dates, I think, from the 'twenties). The two most striking differences seem to me to be :

1. In the formula for Orientals there is nothing corresponding to the clause, “ the true Church, of which I became a child by the force of holy Baptism ” ;

2. In the formula for Orientals the *Filioque* is inserted in the Symbol, and there is no paragraph on the Holy Ghost ; in that for Russians the *Filioque* is not inserted. The Symbol of Faith in the Russian Profession is word for word the Slavonic Symbol from the Byzantine-Slavonic liturgy, except that the word “ Soborniou ” is replaced by “ Kafolitcheskouyou.”

In general the new Profession of 1933 is written with greater precision.

“ In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

“ Bowing down in true belief before the Lord God Who has given me the knowledge of the true and universal Church, of which I became a child by the force of holy Baptism, I . . . firmly believe and confess all that is contained in the Symbol of Faith, namely : I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, Son of God, Only-begotten, and born of the Father before all ages : Light

of Light, true God of true God, begotten not created, consubstantial with the Father, by Whom all things were made. Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and took flesh of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man. Crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried. And rose again the third day according to the Scriptures. And ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of the Father. And comes again with glory to judge the living and the dead, and of His Kingdom there will be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, Lord, Giver of Life, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified, Who spoke by the prophets. In one holy catholic and apostolic Church. I confess one baptism for the remission of sins. I await the resurrection of the dead : And the life of the age to come. Amen."

"I believe that Our Lord Jesus Christ is God and man, completely God and completely man ; that the divinity and the humanity, through their ineffable and inconceivable union in the one Person of the Son of God, bestowed on us the One Jesus Christ, and that consequently the Most Holy Virgin conceived without sin is truly the God-bearer, and that in Christ Himself are contained two distinct natures : the divine and the human, and correspondingly two wills and two sources of operation, *i.e.*, the divine and human natures.

"I believe that the Holy Spirit is not created and not generated, but proceeds eternally, as from one source and by one spiration, from the Father through the Son, according to the expression of the Greek Fathers of the Church—from the Father and the Son, according to the expression of the Latin Fathers ; and that this common belief of the Church is legitimately and wisely professed in the Symbols of the Faith to unmask the heresy which began in the ninth century to deny this belief.

"I believe that there exist seven Sacraments of the New Testament, instituted by Our Lord Jesus Christ for the salvation of the human race, although not all are necessary for everyone : Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders and Marriage ; that they impart grace, and that three of them, Baptism, Confirmation and Orders cannot be conferred a second time.

"I believe that in the celebration of the sacrament of the Eucharist, the wheaten bread, unleavened or leavened, and the wine are really and truly substantially changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, and that under the one species or the other all of Christ is entirely given.

"I believe that the bonds of marriage are indissoluble, and that though in consequence of adultery, heresy or for other reasons a married couple may be permitted to live in separation, nevertheless it is not permitted to either of them to contract a new marriage during the lifetime of the other party.

"I believe that the souls of those who die without sin after Baptism and of those sinners who die in penance and in a state of grace, entirely purified, are at once received into Paradise and enjoy the blessed perception of God, One and Triune, as He is, according to the degree of merit of each, some in a more, others in a less perfect manner ; that the souls of those who die in penance and in a state of grace, but who have not fully expiated during their lives by worthy fruits of penance the sins and negligences they have committed, will be cleansed by the atoning pains of Purgatory ; and that for the remission of the punishment of these souls it is efficacious to have the help of the living, *i.e.*, the Sacrifice of the unbloody Victim, prayers, alms and other works of piety such as are usually offered for the dead by the faithful, in accordance with the Church's decrees ; that the souls of those who die in personal mortal sin are cast down into hell and suffer eternal torments, also according to different degrees ; and that finally the souls of those who die only in original sin remain deprived of the supernatural contemplation of God.

"I believe that to the Holy Apostolic See and Sovereign Pontiff of Rome belongs the primacy in the whole world, that this Sovereign Pontiff is proved to be the successor of Saint Peter, first in supremacy of the apostles, head of the apostles ; that according to the will of the Lord Jesus Christ, the eternal and invisible Head of the Church, he is truly His vicar, the visible head of the Church, the father and master of all Christians, and that the plenitude of power to shepherd the Universal Church, to direct and to reign over it has been handed over to him, in the person of Saint Peter, by the Saviour Himself.

"Without hesitation I accept and confess all that is handed down, decreed and proclaimed by the holy canons and the Œcumenical Councils, including the Councils of Florence, Trent and the Vatican, and in particular what concerns the primacy and inerrant teaching of the Sovereign Pontiff of Rome ; likewise I reject and condemn as heresy and schism all that is not in accordance with the teaching of the Church and all that she condemns.

"Freely and with full knowledge I confess this true orthodox faith outside of which, according to the teaching of the ancient Fathers of the Church, there is no salvation ;

and with God's help I want to keep and to confess it in all its fulness even to my last breath.

"All this I . . . (he puts his right hand on the holy Gospel) promise on oath. May God and this holy Gospel help me to do so." (He kisses the Cross and the Gospel).

(Approved by the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office, April 10th, 1933).

THE WORLD CONFERENCE OF CHRISTIAN YOUTH, AMSTERDAM, JULY 24TH TO AUGUST 2ND, 1939.

The following is a summary of the report given in *Sobornost*, December 1939, by Dr. Zernov.

The main task of the conference was said to be the handing on to the younger generation the faith and zeal of the pioneers of the Œcumenical Movement. From the theological point of view it was a continuation of the discussion between those Barthians and liberals who are interested primarily in the social aspect of Christianity.

Three features distinguished Amsterdam from the preceding Œcumenical conferences: (1) the youth of its members; most of its 1,500 members (representing 71 different countries; there were 400 from North America) were under 26 years of age; (2) the centrality of the Church in all its discussions; out of seven problems suggested to each delegate as an item for study more than half chose that of "The Church"; (3) the prominent position of the Eucharist in its life work.

The inspiring force of the conference was found in its worship. It was not, as in previous and similar gatherings, "interconfessional," but the traditional worship of each group present was celebrated according to its own genus. This culminated in the celebration of four separate Eucharists, that of the Orthodox, the Anglicans, Lutherans and the Reformed Churches.

The Orthodox celebrated the Liturgy on Monday, July 31st, in the main hall of the conference. Three priests and two deacons officiated. English, French, German and Church Slavonic were used in the celebration and those who went to communion represented many nations, viz., Russians, Rumanians, Bulgarians, Serbs, Finns, Estonians and Letts, which shows the growing international character of Orthodoxy. That the Eucharist, still a stumbling block of the different Christian bodies, should yet be considered the central point of worship by all present was a genuine achievement of the Amsterdam Conference.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THE CATHOLIC CENTRE.

SIR,

Dom Wesseling's review of my *Catholic Centre* contains so many misapprehensions of my meaning that I hope you will permit me to reply at some length.

He begins by saying that it "gives him an impression of lightning flashes." This is acutely seen. My mind works that way. But let me observe, lightning flashes illuminate the landscape.

I am accused of subjectivism and a lack of historical sense. As regards the former, the book does not profess to be a history or historical study. Even if it were, it could not, unless it were to be a bare catalogue of facts, be purely objective. I challenge the reviewer to mention any one of the world's greatest historians who never judged from his personal standpoint the events he narrates. My lack of historical sense is, it appears, shown by the fact that I speak of "the ecclesiastical patronage of social injustice" during the Middle Ages. Can the fact be denied? Was serfdom socially just? Did the hierarchy condemn it? The fact that a Bishop was also, as the reviewer points out, a temporal Lord, surely did not dispense him from the obligation of being just. The reviewer thinks Mr. Dawson would not bear out my statement. Clearly I have no right to speak for him. But I may refer Dom Wesseling to his essay on William Langland in *The English Way*, in which he shows clearly that Langland regarded the clergy as patronising social injustice and does not seek to refute the charge.

I am convinced that Fascism is essentially and in principle anti-Christian. For it deifies the state as did the Caesar worship of ancient Rome, the apocalyptic beast. No amount of practical compromise with the Church can alter the fact that Mussolini has declared that there is nothing outside and beyond the state. Nazism is simply the most logical and therefore the worst form of Fascism. Spain and Germany are Fascist, as well as Italy, so also in principle is Turkey. My criticism of Nazism was not inspired by a patriotic war propaganda which has no place in a book concerned with principles. Nazism was evil from the very first, as I have always consistently held. It would not be surprising if Hitler had been influenced by Lueger's notorious antisemitism. What of it? The fact that Lueger was a Catholic did not justify his attitude to the race in which God chose to be Incarnate.

I am supposed to show "a strange familiarity" with "papers like *L'Aube* and *Temps Présent*" of which I have never read a line. As regards M. Maritain's political sympathies, since Dom Wesseling has read *Men and Tendencies* he might have remembered that, unlike M. Maritain, though deploring General Franco's mitigated Fascism my sympathies were with him in his struggle against the *far more evil* Bolshevism of the Reds. Thank God, he, not they, won the civil war. It is a matter for rejoicing when a lesser defeats an enormously greater evil.

All the mystics I have read distinguish essential mysticism, *i.e.*, infused prayer, from charismatic graces. In my book I had of course the former not the latter in mind. Why should a loving God deny infused prayer to devoted souls just because for no fault of their own they are outside His *visible* Church? If the state of grace can exist outside the Church to become the state of glory hereafter why should not its higher earthly form, infused prayer, also be conceded? Why then, asks the reviewer, be a Catholic? We are Catholics, not in order to attain a higher state of prayer, but because Christ founded the Catholic Church.

That Plotinus's conception of God was most seriously defective did not preclude mystical union with Him. For this is effected in a region of the spirit beyond the conceptual understanding. Otherwise a trained theologian would be more likely to be a mystic than a pious peasant woman, which is surely untrue. That neoplatonism has its place in the development of the Platonic-Aristotelian philosophy is a simple fact of history. Did not St. Thomas comment on Dionysius who christianised much of Proclus, and use the neoplatonic *De Causis*?

It is unfortunately impossible to find language not open to misunderstanding. My phrase "The Church in the concrete" can certainly be taken as Dom Wesseling takes it. But it should have been plain from the context that I meant by it simply "the persons who" at any given time "make up the Church." And given the limitations and sinfulness of men it is impossible that they can at any time fully realize all the immeasurable potentialities of Catholic doctrine and life. I can't see what objection can be taken to this assertion. Indeed the reviewer says as much himself.

I entirely agree with the reviewer's admiration for the passage quoted from Prof. Powike. But I fail to see the least incompatibility between it and what I have said. On the contrary it throws light upon the latter by explaining the pagan mentality to which much ecclesiastical materialism was, and

indeed still is, due. In particular it is precisely because the Church cannot "work upon a *tabula rasa*" that this materialism must flourish, as it does. Dom Wesseling follows his quotation by throwing further light on the genesis and nature of ecclesiastical materialism. I heartily endorse the *substance* of his remarks. But again I ask in what way do they contradict my thesis which on the contrary they illustrate and enforce? Unfortunately I cannot agree that there is very little complacency among Catholics. I have myself met with very many instances of it.

To regard God as Personal is not particularly Catholic. On this point I was unaware of any difference when I passed from the Anglican to the Catholic Church.

Dom Wesseling argues that neglect of Bible reading though not to be approved is not "materialism." Whoever said it was? Not I, certainly. In the one chapter devoted to the subject there is not a word about Bible reading. Nevertheless it is more important than Dom Wesseling allows. I would invite him to consider a saying of St. Jerome's quoted in a notice I saw recently in a Catholic church: "Those who do not read the scriptures cannot know Christ." Personally I think this exaggerated, but it might be set against the reviewer's exaggeration in the opposite direction.

"It does not do 'for a convert' to compare what he liked formerly with what he finds now in the Catholic Church." Unless he loses his memory he cannot help doing so. And I should be resisting the known truth, if I denied a fact of my personal experience, namely that I owe to my Anglican teachers and the Anglican Prayer Book a love of liturgy which humanly speaking has enabled me to explore and appreciate to some degree the inexhaustible treasure contained in the Catholic liturgy. Had the latter remained a sealed book to me, I would in all probability have lost my Catholic faith from inability to pierce below an unsatisfying surface. Therefore I thank God for the Catholic truth He gave me by Anglican hands. "The fleshpots of Egypt" I must not love are simply those portions of the Catholic inheritance retained and handed on by Anglicanism. And I may and should love what is Catholic wherever it is found. Nor should a Christian body, such as the Anglican Church, be compared to pagan Egypt. Its Old Testament analogue is schismatic Samaria.

On what grounds does the reviewer allege that I do not appreciate the real value of the Mass as an experience? As I have not dealt with the subject in a book which obviously is no more than a series of essays he cannot tell whether I

do or not. The corporate liturgical celebration of the Mass has of late been treated by so many writers, not least by Dom Wesseling himself, that there seemed no need for me to speak of it. But he seems to suppose, or at least he gives the impression, that I desire "a relay of psalmody before the Blessed Sacrament exposed" to replace the liturgical execution of the Proper and Common of the Mass. Such a preposterous notion never entered my mind. I had in view simply the recitation or chanting of portions of the Divine Office before the Blessed Sacrament exposed. What reason would there be for anyone to wring his hands in despair if the psalmody of the Church on earth were to imitate its heavenly exemplar (see the Bull of Pope Urban VIII in the Roman Breviary) in being sung before the enthroned Lamb? Since my book was published I have been informed by an American priest that a step in this direction has already been taken by a liturgical Holy Hour approved by the Bishop and inspired by a Benedictine Abbey. Far from despairing I rejoiced.

Yours,

E. I. WATKIN.

Our Reviewer replies:—

It is quite possible that I labour under misapprehensions, and I shall be glad to get rid of them as soon as they are clarified. Till then I am afraid I must maintain my position on the following points:—

(1) As to ecclesiastical materialism, I think that to accuse of social injustice a situation in history in which social standards differ from our own is a delicate affair. On the whole, the writers of the Middle Ages themselves accuse prelates and lords, I do not know of definite accusations of the Church as such (I am thinking of, for instance, the Wycliffite interpolation of Archbishop Thornby's Catechism). One can no more say that the Church upheld social injustice than one can say that St. Peter and St. Paul upheld slavery. If the Church does not immediately react and make a clean sweep, there are other reasons for judging this negative line than by accusing her of compliance with the evil.

(2) Mr. Watkin can only call Plotinus a mystic by basing himself on the only two existent sources for Plotinus: his works and his biography by Porphyry. In neither of these sources (although ecstasy is mentioned by Porphyry, but there is no reason to interpret this in the sense of mysticism) is there a hint of that which constitutes the kernel of all genuine mysticism, love of God. Plotinus is a noble but

exclusively intellectual experimentalist. In his works he explicitly rejects not only diverse Christian theses, but creation itself. If Plotinus can at the same time be a genuine mystic and translate his message to us only in terms which ruin all religion (because the relation of Creator and creature is the basis of all religion), I wonder on what grounds we may call him a mystic. Mysticism is not the same as theology, but if we can, not inadequately describe, but formally deny in our spoken word the very essence of our mystical experience, I am afraid that with the ordinary tests of the Church I must reject mysticism where there is incompatibility with truth. As to the more general side of the question, I may be allowed to add another reference to those already given in my review: the very lucid article of Father A. J. Festugière, O.P., on *Psychologie des mystiques*, in *La Vie Spirituelle*, t. LVIII (65).

(3) It was exactly the absence of anything on the Mass when speaking of the Liturgy as the Catholic Centre, which disconcerted me in Mr. Watkin's book. I wish Mr. Watkin had started by discussing what he means by Liturgy. That would have clarified his position. As it is, I must say that his wish for a relay of psalmody before the Blessed Sacrament exposed still proves to me that he has never given the matter serious thought, but is simply drifting on past experiences which are not necessarily liturgical for having been coloured with liturgical prayers and psalms. I do not wish to speak peremptorily, but it would appear to me that this "Blessed Sacrament exposed" has not only turned the Mass into a sheer devotional exercise, but has, *de facto*, given a completely wrong impression of the dogma of the Eucharist to many people. How this came about it is too long to explain here, but it would suffice to peruse the works of Father Peter Browe, S.J., to see how we must look upon this devotional development. History is a lucid master. If I had to try to explain this, I should say that the exposition has accustomed us to see a *static* Christ, where we should always and essentially see a *dynamic* Christ. If I may speak to a philosopher in terms of philosophy, I should say that the whole mistake of our actual theology and philosophy is that all its terms and thoughts and ideas are static, instead of being real and dynamic. That is why all complain about "petrified" scholasticism. This does in no way mean that Christ is "fluid," but it means that though Christ is permanent and stable, He is permanently *acting*. The root of the whole matter is that we cannot see the infinite distance between the *Actus Purus* and the static state of matter and the fluidity of the beings in between. Yet Christ glorified is nothing else but a Christ with a full

and complete share in the *Actus Purus*, not only as God, but, as far as possible (that is the mystery of beatitude) as man. Now the whole point of the Mass is that it re-enacts not a statue, not a painted Christ, but a Christ, renewing the fulness of His redemption, *actu*, in the full actuality of the *Actus Purus*. He does not primarily come to sit still and be looked at: He comes to act, and wants us to act with Him. That is why the Mass is essentially sacrificial communion, communion in the accomplishment anew of Christ's Redeeming Act, accomplishment in ourselves and in our fellow-men and in the whole world. That is why the Consecration must necessarily lead to Communion. That is why Christ becomes present under the species of bread and wine. Even in the (between ourselves, disconcertingly dull) theology of St. Thomas on the subject, in the hymns of the Blessed Sacrament, there is no other way of looking at the Blessed Sacrament than as food and drink. The idea of exposing the Sacred Host, though not bad in itself, is an idea entirely detached from the inherent theology of the Eucharist, such as it was understood for thirteen centuries. Even now the exposed Host may not be destroyed otherwise than by consumption at Communion. When one sees how this "static" view of the Blessed Sacrament can lead priests (as I have seen it with my own eyes) to take the Sacred Host from the Tabernacle to the statue of St. Joseph where Our Lord is done the honour of serving as one more flower-pot, there is really all the reason in the world to wring one's hands when reading of an intelligent philosopher who wants to introduce the exposition into the Liturgy, from which Canon Law has up till now successfully eliminated it; that we have really to do with a new and almost contradictory conception of the Eucharist is shown clearly in the anomaly of the Mass celebrated with the Blessed Sacrament exposed. If anything does show the danger of this new conception it is surely this particular practice which the Church officially discourages. Nor do I think the passage of the Lamb of St. John is relevant because the whole passage is conceived exactly as a marriage-supper. Lastly, the example of that other Benedictine Abbey which seems to agree with one of Mr. Watkin's wishes, only shows that Benedictine and liturgical are by no means synonymous, and how far our American brethren in the liturgical movement still are from treating the liturgical movement with the theological (and other) seriousness which it demands.

On the whole, I cannot get away from the idea that Mr. Watkin is too exclusively intellectualistic, and because of that, too individualistic, and because of that, too static in his

thought (in spite of many an excellent passage in his *Philosophy of Form*), and because of that, perhaps comes a little too close to a form of ecclesiastical materialism which as a genuine philosopher he should abhor.

DOM THEODORE WESSELING.

THE INFLUENCE OF LATIN CHRISTIANITY IN THE EAST.

DEAR FATHER,

I have just received my copy of the current issue of the *EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY*, and I am interested in the letter of "Clericus" dealing with the subject of the influence of Latin Christianity in the East. It is an unfortunate fact that Latin devotions are only too readily adopted by those Easterns who become Catholics, and is probably due to the inferiority complex that many of these seem to have with regard to their own rite. I admit that some Easterns would probably prefer to become Catholics of the Latin rite, but that is not the point, as the Holy Father's instructions that they should remain in their own rite are perfectly clear. The Latin clergy, are, of course, steeped in their own rite and Western tradition and cannot change, nor would one have them do so, therefore it is surprising that the clergy of the Eastern rite are not equally steeped in their tradition. Can it be that there is something wrong about their training and formation? It would seem useless for a Western to adopt the Eastern rite at the Holy Father's behest unless he is really prepared to steep himself in the Eastern tradition. However, there are certain difficulties which confront Westerns who adopt the Eastern rite. For instance, the changing backwards and forwards in some cases from the Eastern to the Western rite. What I mean is adopting the Eastern rite when in a missionary country and abandoning it on returning to the country of origin, thereby giving the impression that rite was of little importance and nothing to do with the spiritual life, and only a matter of expediency. Another instance is the practice of celebrating the Latin Mass on week-days and the Eastern Mass only on Sundays. Practices such as these make an unfortunate impression on the Orthodox, and together with the introduction of many Latin devotions, as described by "Clericus," only confirm their suspicions that, in spite of the explicit instructions of the Holy See to the contrary, if they become Catholics they will gradually lose their Eastern tradition and become Latinised. Finally, it would appear to the Orthodox that, in spite of the excellent

work done by such institutions as the Pontifical Russian College at Rome, fundamentally the strongest influence in the direction of Eastern matters is still a Western one, and instead of the attitude of asking them to come and share the task of bearing the burden of the Catholic Faith, there is that of : " Here it is, and come and learn all about it from *us*."

Yours,

VERITAS.

To the Editor, EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY.
SIR,

Looking through some back numbers of the EASTERN CHURCHES QUARTERLY, I have come across your obituary notice of Father Leo Sembratovich, who was so outstanding a figure among Catholic Ukrainians in America, and I am reminded of an evening I spent with Father Leo on the feast of St. Dimitry at Detroit in 1937. He talked of a visit he had once paid to England, where he had made a point of visiting many Anglican churches during service time and had been deeply impressed by the Prayer Book liturgy and by the congregational participation in it. " With any deficiencies made good," he said to me feelingly, " there is room for that tradition, that fine *pietas Anglicana*, in the all-embracing bosom of the Catholic Church. It is a tragedy that we Catholics are still deprived of it and so much that they could bring to us."

DONALD ATTWATER.

Liverpool,
March 10th.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Plato and Parmenides. By F. M. Cornford. (Kegan Paul).
12s. 6d.

This is the third volume Professor Cornford has given us on Plato's philosophy, and it will be warmly welcomed by all lovers of Plato. In some respects the *Parmenides* is the most difficult of Plato's dialogues, even to the habitual student ; and he must be an enthusiast who will follow with care the entire series of arguments of which this work consists.

Professor Cornford is an excellent guide through this maze of argument. In three introductory chapters he furnishes the reader with concise and clear expositions of the systems

of philosophy which must be known before Plato's *Parmenides* can possibly be attempted. The first chapter describes the earliest Pythagorean cosmogony ; the second is an exposition of Parmenides' *Way of Truth* ; and the third gives us an account of Zeno and Pythagorean atomism.

These three chapters are excellent reading.

With regard to the significance of Plato's *Parmenides*, philosophers are not likely ever to agree. Some have found in it little more than a joke : a *jeu d'esprit* ; but, as Professor Cornford remarks, as such, it is surely "the most wearisome joke in all literature." To the Neoplatonists, on the other hand, it is a work, eminently theological, the most profound analysis of man's knowledge of the mystery of the deity : the ancestor of all treatises on "negative theology." It is true that all theology stands indebted to the *Parmenides* in this very matter ; but was this subject foremost in Plato's mind ? It may be doubted.

The reader will here discover a great deal of light on the doctrine of Forms, the necessary prelude to an understanding of Universals as the mediaeval philosophers present them in their theories of knowledge. But what will be his final impression of Plato's criticisms of ideas of the One and of Being ? Certainly, Plato will not reveal his own conclusions on these great matters ; for the *Parmenides*, as is usual with Plato's dialogues, ends without a conclusion. The reader is made to think, if he has the courage and energy to do so ; and he must think for himself.

What *can* be thought of the *Parmenides*—of the One and of Being, the student will find in the writings of Aristotle, Plato's most distinguished disciple ; and the chief discovery to be made, and the one most necessary for any right understanding of philosophical problems, is the notion of "analogy" : the classification of our knowledge as univocal, equivocal, and analogical : especially the Aristotelean doctrine of the analogy of proportion as expounded in the fifth book of the *Metaphysics*. This doctrine seems to us to be the *lesson* brought home by the abstruse dialectic of the *Parmenides*. Without this distinction in our ways of knowing, Being, and the One, and the Others, remain—as the *Parmenides* implies—outside and beyond the reach of human knowledge.

Whoever, therefore, reads this work, must pass on to Aristotle, or he will read nothing. We owe a debt of gratitude to Professor Cornford for a close study of the whole chain of Plato's argument ; but if the reader would discover the serious argument implied in the dialogue, worthy of Plato, and consistent with the position of the *Parmenides* in the

history of thought, he must pass on to Aristotle. Professor Cornford, it seems to us, might have given greater prominence to this aspect of one of the most profound of Greek writings.

F.A.W.

A Preface to Metaphysics. Seven Lectures on Being, by Jacques Maritain. (London: Sheed & Ward, 1939). Price 6s.

After an Introductory Chapter on Thomistic Metaphysics, its Permanence and its Progress, the author devotes two lectures to the consideration of Being in general, first as apprehended by Common Sense, as object of Natural Science and as object of Logic; then as object of Metaphysics; how its notion can be attained both by rational analysis and above all by ideating intuition. "I have spoken"—so he begins his Fourth Lecture—"of the intuition of being precisely as the subject matter of metaphysics, of being as such, and of the concrete approaches to that intuition, also of the rational analysis which demands it by proving retrogressively that being is our first and indispensable object of thought. I have further observed that this intuition, taken as an *experience* lived by myself, that is from the side of the subject, is like every experience and therefore can be described or suggested only approximately. In this respect we can speak of an intelligible 'revelation,' and say that an intellectual perception invested with a more or less intense emotional atmosphere suddenly confronts us with this extraordinary and 'unimaginable' reality which has risen up, as it were, for the first time before the eyes of the mind. As a result of this perception, it is evident that I myself and all things are subsistent and determinate, snatched from nonentity, loss, disaster, maintained, and maintaining ourselves, outside it" (p. 62). This Fourth Lecture considers then the Analogy of Being, Essence and Existence, the Transcendentals, Being in relation to Tendency, Motion, Extensive and Intensive Abstraction or Visualisation. Then follow three lectures on the First, *i.e.* self-evident Principles of Identity, Sufficient Reason, Finality and Causality, which show how these First Judgments have their basis and origin in the Transcendental properties of Being and the intellectual perception of them. We hope that M. Maritain will one day write a book on these First Principles and their principal derivatives, on their metaphysical connection with the Transcendentals, and show us how these connections can already be traced in the psychological and intellectual development of a child growing into an adult and acquiring Common Sense.

E.L.W.

Avvakum et les débuts du rascol. Pierre Pascal. (Paris, 1938). 618 pp.

The reforms of the patriarch Nikon and the resulting schism (raskol) in the Russian Church, are, perhaps, the most spectacular events in the ecclesiastical history of Russia. After many centuries of isolation, not only from the Western world, but even from Orthodox Greece, ancient Russia, in the seventeenth century, felt deeply the need of breaking its voluntarily and artificially created barriers. National life had already begun to show increasingly obvious signs of impoverishment and barrenness. The grafting of new spiritual energies from without appeared an inescapable result, painful as it might be to Russian national feeling. Two outward sources of Christian life and Christian thought presented themselves for consideration: the Roman Catholic West and Orthodox Greece. Catholicism found its way, in a very mitigated form, through Kiev whence scholars, translators and professors came to Moscow. But the fear of "latin heresies" made another way preferable. Patriarch Nikon was a grecophile who tried to achieve a *rapprochement* with the Christian East. Unfortunately it was not only Greek scholarship (rather poor at that time, but much better than the state of Moscovite culture) that was required and sought for by the Russians. Nikon aimed at a complete assimilation of Russian rites to the Greek ones. The patriarch-reformer was a strict ritualist, in the same degree as all his conservative contemporaries. His only superiority lay in the fact that his ritualism demanded an œcumenical (orthodox) basis. His intolerance and the cruelty of his means caused a great breach in the Russian Church which has not been healed up to this day. The question of Church reform was fused in the next generation, with the issue of general reforms in state and society. The period from Nikon to Peter I was a time of violent struggles, a revolution from above, a (liturgical and canonical) Reformation. Perhaps, this period gives a clue even to the understanding of the Russian crisis of our days.

A French thesis concerning the "protopope" Avvakum, a big, solid book on a Russian priest of the seventeenth century—is a fact remarkable in itself. It proves the universal expansion of interest in Russian culture which is going on in our days; at least it means that Russian culture, at its most Russian, ceases to be inaccessible to the Western world and, like the cultures of India, China and Islam, becomes the common property of the European mind. What is important is not the fact that a French scholar has written

about Avvakum, but that his book is thoroughly free from misunderstandings, from errors of judgment arising from the cultural distance. Such a book might have been written by a Russian scholar of academic training, and that on one condition only: of a personal religious contact between the author and his hero. The paradox is that a book that could have been written by a Russian Old Believer comes from the pen of a French Catholic.

M. Pierre Pascal who had lived in Soviet Russia for many years escaped from his surroundings into the pre-Petrine Russia. His own religious feelings experienced a deep attraction from the mighty and integral devotion of ancient Moscow. And he gave himself to the world revealed to him without any critical doubts and without any confessional reservedness.

M. Pascal knows and loves the seventeenth century in Russia, probably as nobody else of our time. His book is a real treasury of material, often quite new even for a Russian reader. Around his hero he gathers scores, if not hundreds, of miniature portraits of his supporters, disciples, enemies, contemporaries. Every episodic character is introduced with his whole pedigree and career. This, without any doubt, makes the book heavy, yet increases its historical value. Details can live in memory even outside the general picture. I do not know of any other book which would give the reader the chance, by such personal-biographical method (having nothing in common with a "biographie romancée,") to live into the Russian seventeenth century. The value of the book lies, first of all, in the richness and scrupulous accuracy of details, in the matter-of-factness of narratives and descriptions.

With the same accurateness as the historical background, Avvakum's portrait is painted and his destiny is told. One cannot say, however, that the interpretation of this character is as living and convincing as the narrative itself. The author is obviously a biographer of the old school who considers his task rather as an apology, almost as a panegyric; taking into consideration the person of the hero, one could say: as a scientific hagiography. The author does not try to point out contradictions in the hero's character, does not emphasise his human weaknesses which can alone impart persuasiveness to the portrait of any great man. Avvakum, for M. Pascal, is a saint (as in fact he is, for Old Believers), his cause is the cause of the Russian (and universal) Church, lost in the seventeenth century, but waiting for its triumph.

For M. Pascal the "Raskol" (the schism of the Old Be-

lievers) is the only living side in the modern Russian Church and its only link with the Holy Russia of the past. The key to it is found by the author not in ritualism, but in the ideal of Christian life with all its deep moral and ecclesiastic roots. Thence the comparison (hardly a happy one) of the Russian Raskol with Jansenism. M. Pascal considers Avvakum and his friends as the only true successors of that conservative Reform-movement which had been guided by the confessor of the Tzar, Stephan, and the Tzar Alexis himself. Patriarch Nikon and the renewers are, for him, the traitors of this ecclesiastical movement, "westernisers" and liberals, seduced by the charm of external civilisation, by luxury and power. Looking at the Moscovite tragedy with the eyes of the Old Believers, the author refuses to acknowledge any high or Christian motives in the *rapprochement* with the West, in the work of such personalities as the Boyar Rtichtchev and the Tzar Alexis. Even the most extreme religious nationalism of the Old Believers does not scare him. The Catholic historian repeats with sympathy Avvakum's invectives against westernisers and "latinisers." And not only speaks of this nationalism for accurateness' sake, as an inescapable detail, but makes of it one of the main-springs of his historical construction.

This eulogy, suitable in liturgical hagiography, makes it impossible to understand any historical development in which good and evil are never distributed equally between opposite parties or tendencies. While refusing to acknowledge the relative right of Nikon, the author does not refrain from the assertion: "After Nikon there is no longer a Church in Russia" (p. 574); nor from the denial of any Christian content in the Russian literature of the nineteenth century (p. 570). His historical outlook comes near that idealisation of the sectarian Albigenses and Waldenses that was once fashionable in Protestant histories. With regard to the Russian Raskol this point of view is, perhaps, applied for the first time. In this, if you like, one can see an act of belated (though unjustified) retaliation. This philosophy and theology of the Raskol, difficult to reconcile with Catholic universalism, will certainly find acknowledgment in some Russian nationalist circles. What, however, would be for a Russian a confession of fanaticism, for an author of a foreign country and of an alien persuasion, is nothing but the expression of a love, too partial and too credulous.

G. FEDOTOV.

The Liturgy of the Holy Mass according to the Chaldean Rite. By Father Dominic Dahane. Translated from the French by Sister M. L. Hayde. (Father Francis Thomay, 1200 Belden Avenue, Chicago). 50 cents.

So far as we know the only translation of the Catholic use of the Chaldean Liturgy into a western vernacular tongue was until recently Father Gabriel Khury's Italian version: the Liturgy has now been put into French, and that version may be had in English as above, and very useful it is. In addition to the text of the Eucharistic Liturgy, with the *anaphora* of the Apostles Addai and Mari, the booklet contains an historical sketch of the Chaldeans and some interesting liturgical notes. We are only sorry that the translation is not freer from gallicisms and terms which belong only to the Latin rite.

This booklet is published for the benefit of Father Thomay's mission to the five thousand Catholic Chaldeans scattered about the huge city of Chicago. Some time ago we published an appeal on behalf of this mission, and we are glad to learn that at least one of our readers, in Paris, responded with a very generous donation indeed. But Father Thomay is still far from having enough money to build the first Chaldean church in the New World, and we again commend his efforts to our readers' kindness.

When Father Thomay is able to build the church of St. Ephrem, we hope it will be according to the purest tradition of his ancient rite, unmixed with specifically Western elements.
D.D.A.

The Life of Christ. By Chinese Artists. (S.P.G., 1939). 24 photographs. 1s.

If Chinese art is capable in modern times of rising to the power of its great periods Chinese Christians may well produce one of the great schools of Christian art. Whether they brought with them the grandeur of the early Buddhist paintings or the exquisite insight and contemplative calm of the great Sung landscapes their presentation of Christian facts would be invaluable. The superficial prettiness of the Ming tradition has, however, little to bring, and that strange mongrel, a Westernised Chinese art, has small artistic value and is, indeed, very dull. In the present admirable little collection there are some few of these ill-digested adaptations though most of them have merit. The Adoration of the Shepherds, Presentation, Transfiguration, and Washing of the Feet may be instanced and even, to a lesser degree, the exquisite Annunciation. Western grouping, attitudes, and mode of thought are too facilely refitted with Chinese faces and furniture.

More than this is needed : the effort to think out the subject anew in a different idiom.

The best Chinese painting subordinates the human figure to the landscape ; indeed the artist seems to have a deeper insight into the forms of rock, the forms and principles of growth of trees and the effects of mist than into the human form. This presents a difficulty to the Christian artist as it did to the Buddhist, but some of the artists here represented seem to have solved the problem by a close union of mood between the landscape and its figures ; the landscape itself interprets the scene. The crucifixion is a good example : there is a tautness, ready to be rent asunder, in the vertical rocks with the staccato horizontal lines of fir trees, and the Cross belongs to this scene, together with its surrounding figures, the fierce, stage war-lord soldiers and the graceful lines of the contrasting group of holy women and St. John. It is a fine piece of artistic, as opposed to literary, interpretation.

The "Calming of the Sea" is another really fine painting, with a slightly Persian flavour ; the superbly composed confusion of waves and men is contrasted with the poise and calm of the central figure. The water scenes, with their excellent "placing" of subject and space, are, as might be expected, particularly satisfactory ; the draught of fishes and the lovely and improbable flight into Egypt—by boat on a calm lagoon. The snow scenes, "There was no room for them in the inn" and the shepherds, are worthy of mention, as also the fine adoration of the Magi, of a more Mongol type.

It is good to see that the publishers propose further series of such reproductions.

The Christmas number of the *Bucksfast Chronicle* has more excellent reproductions (one in colour) of Chinese paintings of Christian subjects.

E. J. B. FRY.

Early German Art and Its Origins. By Harold Picton. Foreword by Joseph Strzygowski. (Batsford, 1939). 21s.

The publisher has, as he says, been asked to put not a quart but a gallon into a pint pot. An amazing mass of careful information has gone into 148 pages ; and the 101 plates, together with figures and plans—which comprise over 400 illustrations—are an education in themselves. The author has probably chosen the wisest course in illustrating his thesis with the greatest number of reproductions possible. This has meant a reduction in size—though scarcely in quality.

The name of Strzygowski sufficiently indicates the school of thought to which the book belongs : the author is, as

he says, very definitely a Strzygowski pupil, though sometimes venturing to differ from the master. That is to say he belongs to the extreme anti-Roman or "non-classical" school. He turns to Scythic and Armenian origins or parallels and looks as far East as China for parallel art forms. He turns the tables on the Romanists by emphasising the importance of Germanic art and its wide influence, even upon later Rome. Many people have long felt that Strzygowski and his school, like most reactionaries, have carried their theories to an extreme; there is too much seeking after obscure origins and too large an emphasis on ethnic groups and racial theories; "we English Germans," says Harold Picton. Yet the reaction was more than timely. No one with an eye trained to appreciate form and rhythm could be anything but impatient with the old school of historical theorists who insisted so tediously that Rome was the only source of enlightenment on every matter in the world of its day, and that its memory and heritage are the only hope now. In art this is blatantly untrue. The Romans were probably the most inartistic race the world has known; law-makers, road-builders, yes, but artists, no. Besides, the Germanic talent lay in quite a different direction to the Roman tradition, such as it was. They excelled above all in pattern, rhythm, design and colour, and scarcely considered the human form which was almost the only interest of the Romans, an interest often retained by inartistic people probably for reasons artistically quite beside the mark. The mere use of an artist's eye would lead a man in the same direction as the ethnic theories and careful analysis of detail in such a book as this. Yet perhaps the theory has become prejudice when Strzygowski says that "the Romanesque human figure was there by ecclesiastical desire." It is difficult to see why all but abstract design and zoomorphic forms should be considered as fundamentally antagonistic to the Germanic genius. The use of the human figure is a natural enough development (if not necessarily an advance), especially to a people become Christian and wishing to express Christian fact in their art.

E. J. B. FRY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

S.P.C.K., London: *Holy Moscow*; Nicholas Arseniev.
Benziger, Einsiedeln: *Die Kirche Christi*; Otto Iserland.
Tipografia Eparhialia, Balti, Rumania: *Misionarismul Crestin intre Mahomedani in Orientul Apropiat*; Antim Nica.
Mœurs et Coutumes des Fellahs d'Égypt; H. H. Ayrout, S.J.

